1-1-2013

An Investigation Of Traditional Professional Development Versus Reform Professional Development And The Implementation Of Strategies, Curriculum And Classroom Environment By Prekindergarten Teachers

Helen Marie Oliver-Brooks
Wayne State University,

AN INVESTIGATION OF TRADITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT VERSUS REFORM PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES, CURRICULUM AND CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT BY PRE-KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

by

HELEN OLIVER-BROOKS

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2013

MAJOR: CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Approved by:

_____

Advisor Date

_____

_____

_____

DEDICATION

To my mother, Helen V. Oliver, who would often call from Tennessee to remind me there was not time for shopping or procrastinating. To my father, John E. Oliver, Sr. (deceased), who supported me in ways beyond words.

To Auntie Mom and Uncle Daddy, who fed me and encouraged me to complete my dissertation.

To my sisters, Minnie Taylor (Clyde), Barbara Baptist (Larry), Deborah Dunn, Cheryl Brown (deceased), Tamara Scott (José), Miosha Robinson (Leo) and Cynthia Miller for believing in me, their ongoing support and understanding when I missed family gatherings. To my brothers, James C. Stanback (deceased), John E. Oliver, Jr. (Tracy), Grayler A. Oliver (Eloise), and Joseph Miller (Callie) for their support on my journey.

To my cousin, Dr. James Oliver, who began scheduling his air travel for my graduation as soon as he learned about my acceptance into the doctoral program. To my cousin, Timothy Kelly, who never gave up on my journey to completion.

To my nieces and nephews, LaJuana, Tomika (Gerald), Keydrick, LaShonda (Clarence), Justin, Grayler II, LaTondra, Desmond, John III, Jonathan, Jakil, Terrika, Tiffany, Tanecia, Tania, Déjà, Joanna, Micah, Zion and Leo III for their encouragement and love.

To my daughters, Theresa Currie and Rushawn Hester, for their support and encouragement. And finally, to my grandchildren, Tyetonia, Armoni, Tewand, Cordé, Symyia, and Zaire, who were my inspiration to finish the journey and often saying, “Nana, you can study while we have weekend sleepovers. We won’t bother you.”

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Throughout the journey from acceptance into the PH.D program to the completion of the dissertation, I have been supported and encouraged by many scholars, friends, family, and co-workers.

I am extremely grateful to Dr. Marc H. Rosa, who encouraged me to apply for admission to the PhD program in Curriculum and Instruction and continued to support me on my journey as my advisor. His support and belief in me guided my path to success.

A special thanks to Dr. Sharon Elliott, who mentored and supported my academic growth from undergraduate studies through the completion of my PhD.

Dr. Jacqueline Tilles' wisdom and support propelled me on this journey to success, and for this I am grateful.

I would also like to thank Dr. R. Khari Brown for serving as my cognate advisor, for his continued support and encouragement.

I am thankful to the Great Start Readiness Program teachers, associate teachers, and noon hour aides in Detroit who willingly participated in the reform professional development program and completed the 18-page survey.

I am especially grateful to the GSRP Early Childhood Specialists, Cynthia Pitts, Pamela Spencer, Irene D. Dennisuk, Elizabeth Hartley, Joyce Austin-Bohannon, Wanda Lundy-Colquitt, and Cynthia Ulmer for going above and beyond what was required, before, during and after work hours. An extra special thanks to Wanda Lundy-Colquitt for her assistance securing the support of the Detroit Federation of Teachers.

To Cynthia and Dwight Pitts, thank you for all of the work and support during both the traditional and reform professional development years.

Thank you to Wayne Regional Education Service Agency (RESA): Lena Montgomery and her support staff have provided ongoing encouragement and support of the Great Start Readiness Program.

Thank you to the Michigan Department of Education: Dr. Lindy Buch, Richard Lower, Blanche Deren, and Pat Sargent for their support and collaboration towards quality; and the Detroit Federation of Teachers' President, Keith Johnson for his support of the study and mailing the surveys to the prekindergarten teachers.

Special thanks, to the Detroit Public Schools Foundation for Early Learners: Wilma Taylor-Costen, Evelyn Mann, Brenda Berkowitz, Juanita Longmire-Williams, Angeline Benson, Tracy Lewis, Gwendolyn Finney, Connie Osteen-Evans, Shalanda Smith-Leggs, Esq., Beverly Greenwood, Kathleen Murry, Darnell Smiley, and Regina Olden for their support of the Great Start Readiness Prekindergarten Program in the Detroit Public Schools. I would also like to thank Detroit Public Schools, Facilities Department: Felicia Venable-Akinbode, Larry Redfearn, George Vary, Derrick Duffield, Ron Willis, Calvin Reddick, Randy Stevens, John Evans (J. Evans Distribution), Rory, Renee, and the drivers for their assistance with collecting and delivering tables and chairs for the professional development rooms, making inside and outside repairs (including landscaping) and the removal of unwanted and unneeded materials from the GSRP Prekindergarten classrooms. I am grateful to Dr. Deborah Winston, for the weekly meetings; Dr. Jonella Mongo for the encouragement to "just do it"; and Ruben Alicia for being a friend and sharing the journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication ii

Acknowledgments iii

List of Tables viii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

Background 1

Social Learning, Social Development, and Constructivist Theories 3

Social Learning Theories 3

Social Learning Theories Situated 4

Social Development Theory 5

Constructivist Theory 6

Statement of the Problem 7

Purpose of the Study 8

Significance of the Study 9

Hypotheses 9

Definition of Terms 10

CHAPTER 2: THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 13

Introduction 13

Theoretical Perspective on Professional Development 13

Empirical Studies on Professional Development 17

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY 22

Restatement of the Purpose of the Study 22

Research Design 22

Setting for the Study 23
Participants 26
Instrumentation 26
Procedure 28
Data Analysis 29
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS 32
Introduction 32
Description of the Participants 32
Description of the Professional Development for the High Scope Curriculum 36
Engagement in Training 38
Professional Development Evaluation 41
Research Hypotheses 46
Ancillary Findings 49
Summary 51
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations 52
Summary 52
Findings 54
Research Hypotheses 56
Conclusions 58
Study Limitations 61
Educational Implications 62
Recommendations for Future Research 62
Appendix A: Professional Development Survey 64

Appendix B: Research Information Sheet 81

Appendix C: Human Subjects Committee Approval 84

Appendix D: Approval from Detroit Federation of Teachers 85

References 86

Abstract 92

Autobiographical Statement 94

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for High Scope Teacher Survey 28

Table 2: Statistical Analysis 31

Table 3: Frequency Distributions – Gender and Ethnicity 33

Table 4: Frequency Distributions – Professional Characteristics 34

Table 5: Frequency Distributions – School Characteristics 35

Table 6: Frequency Distributions – Professional Development 37

Table 7: Frequency Distributions – Engagement in Professional Development 39

Table 8: Frequency Distributions – Type of Feedback and Guidance Received As Part of Professional Development 40

Table 9: Frequency Distributions – Professional Development Evaluation 42

Table 10: Frequency Distributions – Professional Development Materials and Assistance 43

Table 11: Frequency Distributions – Barriers to Implementation of High Scope Curriculum 45

Table 12: t-Tests for Dependent Samples – Adult-Child Interactions by Type of Professional Development Program 47

Table 13: t-Tests for Dependent Samples – Daily Routine by Type of Professional Development Program 48

Table 14: t-Tests for Dependent Samples – Learning Environment by Type of Professional Development Program 49

Table 15: t-Tests for Dependent Samples – Time Spent, Knowledge and Skills, Preparation and Confidence by Type of Professional Development Program 51

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For far too many teachers in the United States, staff development is a demeaning, mind-numbing experience as they passively "sit and get". Staff development is often mandatory in nature, driven by seat-time requirements such as CEU's, and evaluated by "happiness scales". As one observer put it, "I hope I die during an in-service session, because the transition between life and death would be so subtle" (Sparks, 2004 p. 247).

Background of the Study

Many urban school districts are experiencing challenges of increasing student achievement in the midst of other issues, such as declining enrollment, decreasing funding dollars, highly mobile students/families, discipline/behavior challenges and shortages of qualified staff. Recently a "new challenge" emerged, "high quality staff development." High quality staff development is essential if teachers are to effectively teach basic academic skills, a prerequisite to raising student achievement. An emphasis on basic skills has become particularly important given the increasing technology-driven nature of the job market (Danielson, 2001; Darling-Hammond &Young, 2002; Darling-Hammond 2001). Research on student achievement is unanimous in concluding that high quality staff development activities are a critical determinant of success (Gwen, 2005). Professional development has many names and as many models of presentation styles. There are, however, two formats to further distinguish professional development. The two formats as defined for this study are 1) Traditional Professional Development and 2) Reform Professional Development. Staff development is essential, but must be

significantly different from the approach taken in the past if it is to produce high levels of learning for students and staff members (Jones, 1998; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997).

Traditional Professional Development efforts have typically taken five forms: a) formal education, b) credentialing, c) specialized on the job in-service training, d) coaching and/or conservative interactions, and e) communities of practice (COPs) or collegial study groups (Zaslow and Martinez-Beck, 2006). This type of professional development is expected to be an "outside-in process," where the information necessary for behavior change or professional growth comes from external authorities, imparted through lectures, readings, demonstrations, and verbal advice from press, supervisors, coaches or consultants (Helm, 2007; Wesley & Baysse, 2006).

Reform Staff Development, however, falls under a different paradigm. It is to 1) high quality, 2) high- impact professional learning, 3) professional learning communities, and 4) reflective practices. Recent research explores the complex links between the type of professional development, teachers' learning during professional development activities, and subsequent changes in classroom practice (Borko, 2004). In addition, researchers are designing studies that can help identify the linkage between the type and implementation of professional development and student learning outcomes (Fishman et al., 2003; Loucks-Hoursley and Matsunoto, 1999). This type of the Reform Staff Development impacts the success of students because it is premised on the expectation of classroom implementation of the new teaching practices.

Experts have identified the following professional development practices as helping to improve the quality of early learning:

- individualized classroom coaching and mentoring;
- one-on-one consultation;

- carefully sequenced and ongoing workshops;
- using interaction media to promote deeper understanding of development; and
- continuous progress monitoring (Brandon et al., 2006; Pianta, 2003; Preston et al., 2005)

These elements fall into a theoretical framework that support the effectiveness of the Reform Professional Development model investigated by this study. The following section briefly describes this framework.

Social Learning, Social Development and Constructivist Theories

The concepts discussed in this study utilized the works of social learning theories (Bandura, 1977; Lave, 1991), social development theory (Vygotsky, 1978), and constructivist theory (Bruner, 1983) as foundational for building a conceptual framework for effective professional development, and will be supported more extensively in Chapter 2.

Social Learning Theories

The social learning theory is the theoretical foundation of behavior model that is used in training programs (Bandura, 1977). Social learning theory states, “Most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling; from observing others, one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action” Bandura, 1977(p. 22). Social learning theory is premised on an interactive model; it is the interplay among behavioral, cognitive, and external (environmental) factors that result in human behavior. These three influences form the behaviors we can observe. Three principles associated with Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory are the following:

1. Higher level learning through observation is a result of a learner having rehearsed in his mind what he has observed, and then having taken it a step further by acting on it, often through words. This encodes this behavior for better retention.
2. People are more apt to act on what they have learned from some modeled behavior if it leads to some result that they think is valuable.
3. If the learner admires the person modeling some behavior, or if the person is similar to the observer, the learner is more likely to adopt a modeled behavior if the behavior seems useful.

In addition to the three principles, Bandura (1977) noted four component processes that form the foundation for observational learning which is evident in high-quality professional development:

1. Paying attention to events, which depends in large part on the observer's own characteristics,
2. Retaining, organizing, and rehearsing the observed behavior,
3. Actually reproducing the behavior, and
4. Possessing the motivation, both extrinsically and intrinsically to act.

The three components of attention, memory and motivation support the inclusion of the social learning theory fitting into cognitive and behavioral theories, and the works of Lave and Vygotsky validate the primary role of social learning.

Social Learning Theory (Situated)

Lave (1991) explains learning as being contextualized. Although what happens in the typical classroom is often abstract and not in a context, Lave maintains that learning is situated, that is, it must be embedded in the context of an activity, a situation,

and it takes place in a cultural context as well. Thus, by definition, social interaction is essential to situated learning. People learn certain ways of doing things as they work with each other in a common situation. Traditional Professional Development is not typically "situated learning." It is often held off-site and in a large conference room instead of at the classroom site (the school building). Lave's concept of "cognitive apprenticeship" and Brown's (1989) model of social interaction for acquiring knowledge are both principles that support the "situated theory" as a guide for professional development:

1. New material needs to be presented to teachers in a context where they would ordinarily use this knowledge.
2. Optimal learning depends on social interaction and collaboration.

Social Development Theory

Vygotsky's (1978) theoretical model places "social interaction" at the center of information processing in the human mind, which he calls cognition. Although cognition refers to the way information is processed (thinking, remembering, problem-solving). Learning styles, on the other hand, refer to how an individual learns. Learners tend to go through defined stages as they internalize new learning from a professional development session. Kolb (1984) proposes a theory of experimental learning that involves four principal stages:

1. Concrete Experiences (CE)
2. Reflective Observation (RO)
3. Abstract Conceptualization (AC)
4. Active Experimentation (AE)

High-quality professional development programs use the learning styles information to present to all participants by incorporating various strategies to support the learning of all, what classroom teachers know as just plain good classroom practice. When a learner can cognitively grasp new material with only a facilitating hand, the new material is matched well with the learner's cognitive capacity, or it is within the learner's Zone of Proximal Development, as Vygotsky called it (1962). Material that is out of reach for the learner is outside their ZPD. With the aid of some adult guidance, or with added collaboration with peers, an individual can learn much more than he could if left to work alone. The two principles associated with this theory are:

1. People's cognitive development falls within a range, depending on age.
2. Social interaction is necessary for optimal cognitive development. Vygotsky's ZPD theory is aligned to Bandura's social learning and Lave's situated learning.

These theories further support the collaborative process between colleagues and site-based trainings for high-quality professional development.

Constructivist Theory

To ensure effectiveness, high quality professional development must extend beyond the walls of the training. Staff must be able to build on the new knowledge. According to Bruner (1986; 1990; 1996), learning is a constructive process. Learners arrive at new understandings as they build on their prior knowledge. While individuals are exposed to new ideas, they are actively bringing their own pieces of information and tying them up to the new ones. This process of tying new information to their already-existing cognitive structures, results in even greater learning and understandings. In a sense, it is like saying 2 + 2 = 5. Adding new information to the old, once they are

combined, result in more than just a sum of the two. High quality professional development is not a quick session once or twice a year, but an ongoing training wherein the topics build on the previous topics. Bruner (1986; 1990; 1996) concludes that curriculum should be organized in a spiral manner so that new material is always tied up to already-learned concepts. If this makes for good classroom practice, one wonders why districts do not routinely offer professional development that follows this model. He further states, a theory of instruction should recognize three major considerations:

1. How predisposed are the students to learning the new material?
2. How can the new information best be structured in order to be readily grasped by the students?
3. How can we best design the presentation of new material so that it encourages extrapolation or thinking beyond the information given? (Bruner, 1973)

Statement of the Problem

Regardless of the format of a teacher professional development program, they all have the same long-term goal of implementing a solid curriculum and teaching practices that research indicates will support student success. Which professional development "style" is most successful in ensuring curriculum implementation with fidelity? The traditional conventional methods of providing professional development (hiring consultants, sitting auditorium-style, lecture, group discussion, etc.) are no longer sufficient in providing "transformative changes to teacher practice" (Stein, Silver, and Smith, 1999) In the current economy, districts can no longer afford to spend thousands of dollars per teacher per year, just to bring in outside consultants, and see no change

in teaching practices or in student achievement. Thus, it is necessary to take a look at a reformed model of professional development and examine its impact on teaching practices, in this case, in the context of pre-school education.

Purpose of the Study

The number one question asked at staff meetings, professional development workshops, conferences, audit findings, grade level meetings, etc., is “How do we raise student achievement?” Some answers are, check the data, look at the students test scores, increase the numbers of hours per subject, change the curriculum, drill, drill, drill, prepare more homework packets, recruit volunteers, and many other suggestions, everything except going to the source of the instruction, the teachers. There have been debates over how much education a teacher needs to be qualified or effective. As Pianta (2011) concludes, the debate needs to shift from whether a preschool teacher should have a bachelor’s degree; instead it should focus on building and delivering proven and effective supports for teachers that lead to improved outcomes for children (Pianta et. al, 2005; Powell, Diamond, Burchival and Koehler, 2010). The purpose of this current study was to investigate differences between traditional conventional professional development verses high quality reform professional development and curriculum implementation of classroom practices. Secondly, this study determined if certain types of professional development activities were associated with increased levels of curriculum implementation. Finally, an examination of differences in curriculum implementation, teacher knowledge, and changes to teaching practice based upon the type of professional development that teachers have experienced was a focus of this study.

Significance of the Study

Contemporary evidence provides support for certain forms of professional development that produce children's skill gain (Bierman et. al., 2008; Laundry, Swank, Smith, Assel, and Gumnerig, 2006; Pianta, Mashburn, Downer, Hamre, and Justice, 2008; Powell et. al., 2010; and Raven et. al., 2008). The loosely organized system of educational and developmental opportunities to which young children are exposed in child care, state-funded prekindergarten (PreK) programs, Head Start programs, and a host of other settings is intended as a point of leverage for addressing low levels of (and gaps in) K-12 achievement. Early education is now being viewed as critically important to the child's success later in school; and, therefore, so is the need of teachers for support that enhances their effectiveness in the classroom (Pianti, 2011).

Hypotheses

This study is an investigation of Traditional Professional Development versus Reform Professional Development and the impact on prekindergarten teachers' instruction strategies. The following hypothesis will guide the study.

H_1: Reform Professional Development will result in higher implementation of instructional strategies that support adult-child interaction than Traditional Professional Development.

H_{01}: Reform Professional Development will not result in higher implementation of instructional strategies that support adult-child interaction than Traditional Professional Development.

H_2: Reform Professional Development will result in higher implementation of High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum than Traditional Professional Development.

H_{02}: Reform Professional Development will not result in higher implementation of High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum than Traditional Professional Development.

H_3: Reform Professional Development will result in higher implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment than the Traditional Professional Development.

H_{03}: Reform Professional Development will not result in higher implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment than the Traditional Professional Development.

This study also will explore differences across groups on individual strategies of implementation of the High Scope program to determine whether any specific strategies of a given implementation category differ between the Traditional Professional Development and the Reform Professional Development.

Definitions of Terms

- **Traditional Professional Development (also referred to as the "old paradigm") 2010 – 2011**
  - On-line courses,
  - Study groups,
  - One day workshops,
  - One shot (2.5 to 3 hour meeting),
  - Lecture style for large groups (can include up to 400 participants), and
  - No follow-up to implementation
  - No Hands-On Involvement
  - Multiple Copies of Handouts/PowerPoint Presentations

- Distribution of Books, and DVDs, to view when questions arise;
- Consultants (from Other Districts, Departments, Publishing Companies, Authors).

- **Reform Professional Development (also referred to as the "New Paradigm) 2011-2012**, will include the following components:
  - Begins with a clear sense of what students need to learn and be able to do;
  - Is based on standards for student learning, teaching and staff development;
  - Focuses on school wide goals for student learning that are based on the unique strengths and challenges faced by that particular school community (Renyi, 1998); Council of Chief State School Officers, 1997).
  - Is job embedded and team based;
  - Is matched to the instructional processes devised in the school;
  - Is focused to a large extent on content and content specific pedagogy;
  - Provides on-going follow-up in the classroom over a sustained period of time
  - Provides generous amounts of time for collaborative work and various learning activities.
  - Provides observation/feedback and modeling as needed
  - On-going access to the workshop presenter (Early Childhood Specialist or Coach) via phone calls or emails;
  - Small groups (max. 44 participants) per workshop;
  - Specific time frame of 3 hours max. per workshop;

- Follow-up to implementation workshop within 2 weeks of the previous workshop
- All workshops must include: objectives, actively engaged participants, modeling, practice, time for reflection, workshop evaluation and planning for implementation;
- A cohesive professional development plan for the complete school year (thereby building on the previous PD) to allow for scaffolding; and
- The workshop presenter is also the Early Childhood Specialist assigned to provide support to the 22 classrooms.

- **Active Learning** – processes include discussion/dialogue, writing, demonstrations, inquiry, reflection, metacognition, co-construction of knowledge, practice with feedback, coaching modeling, and problem solving. Through exploration of individual and collective experiences, learners actively construct, analyze, evaluate, synthesize knowledge, and practices (National Staff Development Council)
- **Co-Hort Groups – (For this study)** is a group of 22 teams which will remain constant for all of the professional development sessions.
- **Staff Development** - is defined as those processes that improve the job-related knowledge, skills or attitudes of school employees. (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989).
- **CEU** – is defined as Continuing Education Credits.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter 2 will present the theoretical and empirical framework of cognitive learning styles and the theories associated with them. The theoretical framework focuses on learned behaviors, social interaction and scaffolding knowledge as it relates to classroom implementation of (a) specific teaching strategies, (b) new curriculum components, and (c) new classroom learning environment. The empirical framework focuses on research findings on learned behaviors, social interaction and scaffolding knowledge as it relates to the three dependent variables of classroom implementation: (a) implementing prescribed instructional strategies, (b) implementing the prescribed curriculum components, and (c) implementing the prescribed physical classroom environment.

Theoretical Perspective on Professional Development

The greatest frustration for school leaders and classroom educators is the difference between what we know and what we do (Reeves, 2010). Often teachers are assigned to teach curriculum in various grades without any specific training, professional development or classroom support. It is assumed that teaching staff can quickly learn enough about the curriculum to implement with fidelity. According to Knapp (2003), learning refers to demonstrable changes in teachers' knowledge, skills, beliefs, and commitments. Learning can also refer to changes in practice. Capturing teacher learning, however, requires theoretical models against which teachers' acquired knowledge can be measured (Wilson & Barne, 1999).

Theories of human development are primarily concerned with the individuals' acquisition of skills and knowledge (Youniss, 1980) and general adaptation to the environment, but the value placed on social interaction varies from theorists to theorist. If teachers are expected to use classroom strategies that encourage teacher-child interaction, Bandura's (1977) Social Learning Theory requires that the teachers first must observe and model the prescribed behaviors, and notice the attitudes and reactions they get from others. Bandura's (1977) notion of "reciprocal determination" suggests that the world and a person's behavior cause each other; by contrast, behaviorism basically claims that one's environment causes one's behavior. As elaborated on in Chapter 1, Bandura (1977) claimed that there were four essential components for learning to occur effectively, and in this case, in the context of professional development. To revisit them, they were:

1. Paying attention to events, this depends in large part on the observer's own characteristics,
2. Retaining, organizing, and rehearsing the observed behavior,
3. Actually reproducing the behavior, and
4. Possessing the motivation, both extrinsically and intrinsically to act.

A closer examination of these four conditions will provide theoretical support for Reform Professional Development and the effective implementation of the High Scope Curriculum using newly-learned strategies. Because the social learning theory incorporates attention, memory, and motivation, it therefore addresses both cognitive and behavioral frameworks. For this reason, the Social Learning Theory is related to Vygotsky's Social Development Theory and Lave's theory on Situated Learning.

Thus, for teachers to implement strategies that promote teacher-student interaction, teachers must see this modeled in their professional development. Lave's Situated Learning Theory (1990) addresses the social interaction and the social construction of knowledge. The precepts of Lave and Wenger (1991) support a model of professional development wherein the process involves building on previous sessions. Being a participant in Reform Professional Development requires social interaction and collaboration, which are essential components of situated learning. Learners are part of a "community" who share certain beliefs and behaviors (Lave & Wenger, 1990). Reform Professional Development also supports having trainings in authentic locations, such as classrooms in schools. The work of Brown, Collin, and Duguid (1989) supports this model of collaborative support for authentic learning activities, both outside and inside school. This is referred to as "cognitive apprenticeship" and was based on the Situated Learning Theory which is directly related to Vygotsky's Social Development Theory. Thus, these theorists embrace many common tenets with regard to optimal conditions for learning. It would follow that modeling them in the professional development sessions would be the most likely way of persuading the teachers of their value in their own classroom, which is likely to lead to implementation of such strategies in their own classrooms.

Vygotsky's Social Development Theory is one of constructivism that focuses on three major themes:

1. Social Interaction is at the heart of cognitive development. In the Reform Professional Development, staff is actively involved by working in small groups, having table discussions, etc.

2. The More Knowledgeable Other, anyone who has a better understanding or a higher ability level than the learner (Presenter, coach, ECS, co-worker). The teaching teams are depending on the presenters (ECS) for guidance, direction and support.
3. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), the optimal condition where learners can solve problems with some guidance, is a natural component of professional training that would lead to the transfer of workshop knowledge to classroom implementation (Vygotsky, 1978).

Reform Professional Development supports scaffolding by allowing active engagement, planning and practice in the workshop prior to implementing in the classroom. Participants are able to interact with others in similar classroom environments, which offer additional support from colleagues.

Finally, the constructivist theory of Jerome Bruner provides further theoretical support for the reform professional development. Recognizing that learning is an active process in which learners construct new knowledge, the presenter of the reform workshops are facilitators, organizing the information so the learners can process at their level of understanding, building on prior knowledge, which Bruner (1966) calls "spiral mapping." Bruner (1966) says that an effective instructional model should always include the following: (a) Personalization, (b) Content structure, (c) Sequencing, and (d) Reinforcement. All of these components are supported in Reform Professional Development. Instruction is personalized by having the same presenter for the duration of the trainings. The content structure is designed so that all participants can follow and support each other. Sequencing is essential, as all of the sessions are scaffold, based on the previous training. Reinforcement is given by co-workers on the same team, in

the same building and by the coach/specialist. Rewards are intrinsic and no punishments are given.

To summarize, the five theoretical perspectives discussed on cognitive learning styles (Bandura, 1977; Bruner, 1966; Collin & Dugruid, 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978) support the Reform Professional Development model of facilitating the learning process for the participants. Recognizing the importance of cognitive learning styles will further facilitate success in transferring the information into curriculum implementation with fidelity. The goal of this study is to show the long-term effects of reform professional development and how it translates into improved curriculum implementation, adult-child interaction, and instructional strategies.

Empirical Studies on Professional Development

Several empirical studies have examined the effects of professional development on implementing changes in teacher practices. Each hypothesis was examined in light of the studies.

H_1 *: Reform Professional Development will result in higher implementation of instructional strategies that support adult-child interaction than Traditional Professional Development.*

Since learning theories help define what best practices are, Mouza (2009), chose to examine the long-term impact of research-based professional development on teacher learning and practice with respect to technology. Data were collected from seven urban teachers, two years after their participation in a year-long technology-focused professional development program. Findings suggest that participation in professional development that is grounded in the currently accepted best practices does

not only impact teacher learning and practice, but can have long-lasting effects on their teaching.

More specifically, Giard, Girolametto, Weitzman and Greenburg, (2011) examined the effects of educators' participation in an in-service training program on the aggressive and pro-social behaviors of preschool-age children. This study was based on seventeen early-childhood educators randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Sixty-eight preschool children were involved in the study. Their results showed that the "in-service" training (for the experimental group) that focused on modeling teacher behaviors for promoting peer interactions, significantly improved children's pro-social behaviors during small group interactions in the classroom. Thus, they found a clear connection between professional development on the teacher role of facilitating peer interaction, and the implementation of these strategies in the classroom.

Yet another study showed promise for certain types of professional development and their impact on teacher-child interaction. Fuligni, Howes, Lara-Cinisomo and Karoly (2009), conducted a naturalistic investigation of the patterns of formal education, early-childhood education training, and mentoring of a diverse group of urban early childhood educators participating in the Los Angeles: Exploring Children's Early Learning Settings (LA Ex CELS) study. Their study of 103 preschool teachers and family childcare providers serving primarily low-income 3- and 4-year-old children in Los Angeles County provided data on their education, training and beliefs about teaching. The results of their study showed an association between professional development experiences and teachers' beliefs and practices, suggesting the importance of higher levels of formal training for enhancing the quality of teacher/child interaction.

***H_2** : Reform Professional Development will result in higher implementation of High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum than Traditional Professional Development.*

Domitrovich, Gest, Gill, Jones, and DeRousie (2009), examined factors associated with process and content outcomes of the training provided in the context of Head Start (REDI) Research Based Developmentally Informed. REDI professional development included four days of training and weekly coaching. Data were collected for twenty-two intervention teaching pairs (N=44). They found that openness to consultation showed a significant association with the training provided. The findings emphasized the importance of teacher engagement in the training process for program effectiveness

In another recent study, Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, and Gallagher (2007) examined the effects of different characteristics of professional development on teachers' knowledge and their ability to implement the prescribed program. The study used a sample of 454 teachers. This study pointed to the significance of teacher perceptions about how coherent their professional development experiences were in increasing teaching knowledge and promoting program implementation.

In another study that examined specific characteristics of professional development, and compared their effects on teacher reflection and learning, Camburn (2010) examined whether embedded learning opportunities for teachers are more supportive of reflective practice than traditional professional development. The sample consisted of 80 public elementary schools affiliated with Accelerated Schools Project (ASP) or Success For All (SFA). The results indicated that these two kinds of embedded learning opportunities were positively and strongly associated with teacher

reflection, and showed twice the effect on teacher learning than had resulted from the traditional professional development. These two studies lend strength to the contention that the appropriate type of professional development, where teacher knowledge is increased significantly, is more likely to result in implementation of newly prescribed curriculum.

Finally, in an extensive study of teacher-prepared lessons, Correnti (2007) examined the effects of professional development on literacy instruction using 75,689 lessons from 1,945 classrooms in 112 schools participating in the study of Instructional Improvement. The results revealed the importance of professional development as an indicator for changing teacher practice. Teachers receiving intense professional development offered 10% more comprehension instruction than teachers not receiving intense Professional Development. This finding suggested that an extended, in depth, and engaging professional development has a significant impact on teacher implementation of curricular programs.

H_3: *Reform Professional Development will result in higher implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment than the Traditional Professional Development.*

Koh and Neumann (2009) examined the efficacy of a practice-based approach to professional development for family childcare providers working in low-income communities. One hundred twenty-eight family childcare providers were randomly assigned to three groups: a language and literacy course plus coaching, the course only, and the control group. Quantitative results revealed that providers, who received the course plus coaching, experienced statistically and educationally significant improvements in creating the classroom environment that supported literacy-promoting

practices compared to the other two groups. Thus, a professional development model including coaching (like that of the Reform Professional Development being investigated in this study) was found to have a significant impact on the classroom environment.

Finally, a large study conducted by Landry, Swank, Anthony, and Assel (2010) gave support to the general idea of providing comprehensive professional development training if schools are to see their teachers understand and implement new curriculum or improved classroom environments. The Landry study involved a comprehensive professional development program for early childhood educators across three types of service delivery systems (i.e. Public School, Head Start, and Childcare) in 11 communities. Two hundred twenty teachers serving 3,834 children were randomly assigned to receive either the comprehensive program or not to receive it. The program improved teachers' instructional practices relative to controls, and a second year of participation resulted in greater gains in children's language and literacy. Results support the need for well-integrated, comprehensive professional development for early childhood educators.

In conclusion, numerous empirical studies support a careful examination of professional development models and show the need for intense, comprehensive, and collegially supported professional development in order to bring the desired results of increased teacher knowledge, increased teacher reflection, implementation of new strategies, implementation of new curriculum components, and the creation of research prescribed classroom environments.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the participants and the method that was used to collect and analyze the data. In addition, the following items were also included in this chapter: Restatement of the Purpose of the Study, the Research Design, Setting for the Study, The Participants, The Survey, and Data Collection and Analysis Procedures.

Restatement of the Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether Reform Professional Development resulted in higher implementation of instructional strategies that supported adult-child interaction than Traditional Professional Development. Secondly, this study examined whether Reform Professional Development resulted in higher implementation of the High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum than Traditional Professional Development. Finally, this study determined if Reform Professional Development resulted in higher implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment than the Traditional Professional Development.

Research Design

This study was a nonexperiemental, within-subjects design. The same group of teachers participated in the same sequence of the two training protocols. This study included one independent variable and three dependent variables. The independent variable consisted of two levels: the Traditional Professional Development Model and the Reform Professional Development Model. The three dependent variables were (a) implementation of the High Scope instructional strategies that supported adult-child interaction, (b) implementation of the High Scope "daily routine" curriculum, and (c) implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment. This study used

three t-tests for dependent samples, one for each dependent variable. This study also explored differences across groups on individual strategies of implementation of the High Scope program to determine if any specific strategies of a given implementation category differed between the traditional professional development model and the reform professional development model.

Descriptive data were presented on various demographic features of the sample. Implementation of curriculum changes made by teachers were explained in part by the teacher's own motivation to incorporate new teaching strategies in their classrooms, rather than being an effect of their actual training. Any potentially confounding effects from the demographic variables, including motivation, were controlled for by the within-subjects research design.

The 132 participants selected for the study constituted the primary unit of analysis. Research data were collected using a survey with multiple sections addressing each of the variables under consideration. The survey was adapted from "The Globe Teacher Survey on Professional Development" (Penuel et.al. 2007). The instrument was revised to fit the needed criteria for the study. Portions of the professional development were designed and implemented based on the model utilized by the High Scope Foundation in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Setting for the Study

The study was conducted at an urban public school district located in Michigan. The professional development occurred at the Administration building and each meeting was a 3-hour session. The Early Childhood Specialist who provided the support also presented the workshop information. The school district had three prekindergarten programs, 7 Title I rooms, 56 Head Start rooms (federally funded) and 132 Great Start

Readiness Programs rooms (state funded). For the purpose of this study, only the teachers for the Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) were included in the sample.

The GSRP program was funded by the Michigan Department of Education to service 2,112 students. Students were selected by age (4 by December 1 of the school year) and also needed 1 – 2 of the following risk factors:

1. Extremely low family income (below 200% of FPL)
2. Low family income (200 – 300% of FPL)
3. Diagnosed disability or identified developmental delay
4. Severe or challenging behavior
5. Primary home language other than English
6. Parent/guardian with low educational attainment
7. Abuse/neglect of child or parent
8. Environmental Risk

Each student needed a minimum of two risk factors, unless extremely low poverty (based on income documentation) is the documented risk factor. Extremely low income counted as 2 points. The classroom teacher-student ratio was 1:8 and was licensed by the State of Michigan Department of Human Services for 18 students maximum. The classroom staff consisted of a state certified, ZA (Early Childhood) endorsed teacher, a highly qualified (per No Child Left Behind Act) associate teacher and a noon hour aide. Students were in class four full days each week, with Fridays reserved for professional development, preparation periods, home visits, and monthly parent meetings. The Central Office Support Staff consisted of a Program Supervisor, six Early Childhood Specialists, two Social Workers, one Psychologist, one Registered

Nurse, one Parent Involvement Administrator, one Training Coordinator, one School Technician, two Secretaries, and two part-time graduate students.

The new curriculum (Research Based, High Scope) was selected for implementation in 2010-2011 based on a Michigan Department of Education Audit finding. The High Scope curriculum was adopted in August, 2010, and only two Early Childhood Specialists were providing support for 132 classrooms. Professional development was provided in the traditional method of lecture style to the entire group of 264 (teachers and associate teachers) and lacked the following items: continuity, a regular presenter, a consistent location each time, follow-up to implementation sessions, classroom support, etc. With the addition of five qualified Early Childhood Specialists (one person retired, leaving a total of six), training was needed to ensure equal footing for the Early Childhood Specialist (ECS) providing classroom support. The ECSs, the training coordinator, and the Program Supervisor completed the Trainer of Trainer classes at The High Scope Foundation in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

The Reform Professional Development strategy was introduced and modeled as a part of the Trainer of Trainer Program. The training was presented in small pieces (inch wide and a mile deep) and small groups. The High Scope classes were presented over a 6-month period in weekly settings (6 hours a day x 5 days a week x 2 weeks each month). Homework assignments included planning and implementing actual classroom lessons; as well as video taping, and analyzing the data. The 2011-2012 school year began with the High Scope Reform Model for professional development, that included smaller groups (cohort groups of 22), Cohort groups (same people in each session, lead by the same ECS), bimonthly meeting, 1st Friday of each month was reserved for new workshop information, 3rd Friday of each month was reserved for

follow up to implementation (observation/feedback, round table discussion, what worked/failed, etc.), interactive (hands-on and movement), plans for immediate implementation, practice sessions, evaluations, and classroom support by ECS on a rotating schedule.

Participants

Participants in the study were lead teachers in 132 classrooms. The lead teachers had at least a bachelor's degree, teaching certificate with a ZA (early childhood) endorsement and had taught pre-kindergarten for a minimum of five years. A total of 132 participants participated in the study. The survey was completed in June, 2012, at the conclusion of the reform professional development school year. All participants with the exception of 2 were in the GSRP classrooms in 2010-2012 and had participated in the earlier traditional professional development.

Instrumentation

The revised Globe Teacher Survey on Professional Development (2005) was designed by Renuel et al., to collect a detailed description of experiences in professional development. The revised instrument (survey) had four sections (Overall Professional Development, Outcomes of Professional Development Experiences, General Information about High Scope Implementation, and Demographics). The questions were "fill in the blank", "mark responses with an 'X'" and "other" choose-your-response based on the level of approval, and a 3 to 5 point Likert Scales ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The adaptation of the instrument was required to reflect the implementation level, professional development experiences, and demographics of the participants. Completion of the survey included language for securing implied consent from the participants.

Scoring.

The data were numerically entered into SPSS to conduct the statistical analyses to describe the sample and address the research questions. Frequency distributions were used with specific strategies to examine differences across groups in implementation of those strategies.

Reliability.

Because results rely on the accuracy of the collected data, the self-reporting nature of participant responses could be have been considered a limitation. However, when teachers were asked about specific practices and the frequency with which they engaged in them, there was often good agreement between teacher self-report and observations (Mayer, 1999; Porter, Kirst, Osthoff, Smithoon, & Schneider, 1993).

The High Scope Teacher Survey on Professional Development was developed by adapting questions from the Globe Teacher Survey (Penuel et al., 2005), which had adapted questions from Garet et al. (2001) survey that was used in their original analysis of effective professional development. Due to the questions being used from an earlier instrument, extensive pilot testing was not completed.

The internal consistency of the responses on the survey was determined by calculating Cronbach alpha coefficients for each of the subscales on the survey. Table 1 presented the alpha coefficients for each of the subscales.

Table 1

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for High Scope Teacher Survey

High Scope Teacher Survey Subscales	Alpha Coefficient
Adult child interaction	.94
Daily routine	.94
Learning environment	.84

The alpha coefficients obtained on the surveys ranged from good to excellent. Based on these coefficients, the three subscales on the survey appeared to have sufficient internal consistency to be considered reliable.

Validity.

The original survey was validated using a process of expert review: two partner coordinators, one external researcher, and the GLOBE administrator for partnerships each reviewed items for relevance, appropriateness, and importance for program improvement. Items judged less appropriate, irrelevant, or not important were removed from the survey. In addition, changes were made to items based on specific feedback from the validation panel to improve the likely comprehensibility of the items (Penuel et al., 2005).

Procedures

Once approved from the Human Investigation Committee, the researcher completed the data collection process. Survey packets were prepared that included copies of the surveys and a copy of the research information sheet. The use of the research information sheet provided the same information as included on an informed consent form, but did not require a signature. The return of the completed survey acted as acknowledgement of the teachers' willingness to participate in the study. Use of a

research information sheet provided additional assurances of anonymity as the teachers' names did not appear on any document associated with the research.

The researcher gave each teacher an envelope at the last professional development meeting in June 2012. They were asked to place their address on the envelopes and return them to the researcher. The researcher placed return address labels on the envelopes and provided the appropriate postage. The surveys were placed in the envelopes, which were then given to the union representative who was responsible for putting the survey packets in the mail. Included in the envelope was a preaddressed, postage-paid envelope for confidential return of the completed survey. Teachers were asked to return the completed survey in seven working days.

Because the surveys were not coded in any way and no teacher names were available, no follow-up was possible or needed. Two weeks following the initial mailing of the survey packets, data collection was considered complete. After entering the surveys into a computer file for statistical analysis, the researcher placed the completed surveys in a locked file cabinet located in her home for safe storage. All surveys will be destroyed seven years following completion of the study.

Data Analysis

The data files created from the surveys were analyzed using IBM SPSS – Ver. 20.0. The data analysis was divided into three sections. The first section of the data analysis used frequency distributions, cross tabulations, and measures of central tendency and dispersion to provide a profile of the participants using the responses to the demographic questions. The second section of the data analysis compared the traditional and reform professional development for the High Scope Curriculum. Inferential statistical analyses, using t-tests for dependent samples, was used in the

third section to test the three hypotheses developed for the study. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings of the inferential statistical analyses were made using a criterion alpha level of .05. The research hypotheses, variables, and statistical analyses used in this study were presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Statistical Analysis

Research Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analyses
H_1: Reform professional development will result in higher implementation of instructional strategies that support adult-child interaction than traditional professional development. H_{01}: Reform professional development will not result in higher implementation of instructional strategies that support adult-child interaction than traditional professional development.	Dependent Variable Adult-child interactions Independent Variable Type of professional development Reform Traditional	t-test for dependent samples will be used to test for differences in the perceptions of adult-child interactions between the two types of professional development, reform or traditional
H_2: Reform professional development will result in higher implementation of High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum than traditional professional development. H_{02}: Reform professional development will not result in higher implementation of High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum than traditional professional development.	Dependent Variable High Scope Daily Routine Independent Variable Type of professional development Reform Traditional	t-test for dependent samples will be used to test for differences in the perceptions of High Scope daily routine between the two types of professional development, reform or traditional
H_3: Reform professional development will result in higher implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment than the traditional professional development. H_{03}: Reform professional development will not result in higher implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment than the traditional professional development.	Dependent Variable High Scope classroom learning environment Independent Variable Type of professional development Reform Traditional	t-test for dependent samples will be used to test for differences in the perceptions of High Scope classroom learning environment between the two types of professional development, reform or traditional

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The results of the data analysis used to describe the sample and address the research questions were presented in this chapter. Chapter four was divided into three sections. The first section described the participants using frequency distributions. The second section provided a description of the traditional and reform professional development programs. The results of the inferential statistical analyses used to test each of the three hypotheses were presented in the third section of the chapter.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between traditional conventional professional development verses high quality reflective professional development and curriculum implementation of classroom practices. Secondly, this study determined if certain types of professional development activities were associated with increased levels of curriculum implementation. Finally, this study investigated whether there was a statistically significant difference in curriculum implementation, teacher knowledge, and changes to teaching practice based upon the type of professional development that teachers experienced.

A total of 132 Detroit Great Start Readiness Prekindergarten Program teachers participated in the traditional professional development program during the 2010-2011 academic year. These same teachers then participated in a reform professional development program during the 2011-2012 academic year. At the end of the 2011-2012 academic year, the participants were asked to complete a survey regarding their participation in both programs. Of the initial 132 teachers, 74 completed and returned the surveys for a response rate of 56.1%.

Description of the Participants

Frequency distributions were used to summarize the personal and professional characteristics of the participants. Table 3 presented the results of the analysis for gender and ethnicity.

Table 3

Frequency Distributions: Gender and Ethnicity

Gender and Ethnicity	Number	Percent
Gender		
Female	72	97.3
Male	2	2.7
Total	74	100.0
Ethnicity		
African American - NonHispanic	36	53.7
Caucasian – NonHispanic	27	40.3
Hispanic	4	6.0
Total	67	100.0
Missing 7		

The majority of the participants indicated their gender was female (n = 72, 97.3%). The largest group of teachers reported their ethnicity was African American – NonHispanic (n = 36, 53.7%). Twenty-seven (40.3%) teachers indicated their ethnicity as Caucasian – NonHispanic, with 4 (6.0%) reporting their ethnicity as Hispanic. Seven participants did not provide a response to this question.

The teachers' professional experiences were obtained from the survey. Their responses were summarized using frequency distributions for presentation in Table 4.

Table 4

Frequency Distributions: Professional Characteristics

Professional Characteristics	Number	Percent
Education/Degree		
Bachelors	9	12.9
Masters	52	74.3
Doctorate	9	12.9
Total	70	100.0
Missing 4		
Years of Teaching Experience		
3 to 5 years	2	2.7
8 to 11 years	6	8.1
12 years and over	66	89.2
Total	74	100.0
Years of Prekindergarten Experience		
0 to 2 years	5	6.8
3 to 5 years	9	12.4
6 to 8 years	7	9.6
8 to 11 years	16	21.9
12 years and over	36	49.3
Total	73	100.0
Missing 1		

The majority of the teachers (n = 52, 70.3%) had completed master's degrees, with 9 (12.9%) participants reporting their highest degree was a bachelors. Nine (12.9%) teachers had completed doctorate degrees. Four teachers did not provide a response to this question.

Most of the teachers (n = 66, 89.2%) had worked in education for 12 and more years. Two (2.7%) teachers had been in education for 3 to 5 years, with 6 (8.1%) teachers reporting they had 8 to 11 years of experience in education.

The greatest number of teachers (n = 36, 49.3%) reported they had worked in pre-kindergarten education for 12 or more years. Sixteen (21.9%) had worked at this level for 8 to 11 years, with 7 (9.6%) reporting 6 to 8 years of experience in pre-kindergarten education. Nine (12.3%) teachers had worked in pre-kindergarten teaching

for 3 to 5 years, and 5 (6.8%) had worked for two years of less in pre-kindergarten education. One teacher did not provide a response to this question.

The participants provided information regarding their schools and the demographics of the schools. The results of the frequency distributions used to summarize the responses to these questions were presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Frequency Distributions: School Characteristics

School Characteristics	Number	Percent
Type of School		
Elementary (pre k – grade 5)	33	45.2
Elementary/Middle school (pre k – grade 8)	40	54.8
Total	73	100.0
Missing 1		
Number of High Scope Teachers Assigned to School		
1 to 2	32	44.4
3 to 5	35	48.7
More than 6	5	6.9
Total	72	100.0
Missing 2		
Number of Students Participate in High Scope		
16	7	9.7
32	30	41.7
48	21	29.2
More than 48	14	19.4
Total	72	100.0
Missing 2		

Thirty-three (45.2%) reported the configuration of their school was a traditional elementary with students from prekindergarten through fifth grade. Forty (54.8%) percent of the teachers were assigned to elementary/middle schools with grades pre-kindergarten through eighth grade. One teacher did not provide a response to this question.

When asked how many High Scope teachers were assigned to their schools, the largest group (n = 35, 48.7%) reported their schools had 3 to 5 High Scope teachers. Thirty-two (44.4%) participants reported 1 to 2 High Scope teachers and 5 (6.9%) participants reported their schools had six or more High Scope Teachers. Two teachers did not provide a response to this question.

Seven (9.7%) teachers indicated they had 16 students in the High Scope curriculum, with 30 (41.7%) teachers reporting they had 32 students in the High Scope curriculum. Twenty-one (29.2%) teachers reported having 48 students in the curriculum and 14 (19.4%) teachers had more than 48 students in the High Scope curriculum. Two teachers did not provide a response to this question.

Description of the Professional Development for the High Scope Curriculum

The participants in both the traditional and reform professional development programs for the High Scope Curriculum were asked to indicate number of months in training, source of training, total hours in training, and span of training. The responses to these items for the 2010-2011 academic year and the 2011-2012 academic years were summarized using frequency distributions for presentation in Table 5.

Table 5

Frequency Distributions –Professional Development

	Type of Professional Development Program			
	Traditional (2010-2011)		Reform (2011-2012)	
Professional Development	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Months Spent in Professional Development				
1	6	8.3	0	0.0
2	13	18.1	0	0.0
3	3	4.2	0	0.0
4	2	2.8	0	0.0
5	3	4.2	0	0.0
6	2	2.8	0	0.0
7	3	4.2	1	1.4
8	1	1.4	3	4.1
9	11	15.2	15	20.3
10	6	8.3	31	41.9
11	22	30.5	24	32.4
Missing	2			
Total Hours Spent in Professional Development				
4 to 7 hours	1	1.4	0	0.0
8 to 11 hours	4	5.5	1	1.4
12 to 15 hours	5	6.8	0	0.0
16 to 19 hours	5	6.8	0	0.0
20 and more hours	58	79.5	73	98.6
Missing	1			
Sources of Training				
In-district workshop	70	94.6	44	59.5
More than one source	4	5.4	30	40.5
Span of Training				
<1 day	4	5.4	4	5.4
1 day	3	4.1	4	5.4
2 to 4 days	15	20.3	1	1.4
1 week	4	5.4	2	2.7
1 month	4	5.4	3	4.1
>1 month	44	59.4	60	81.0

The months in training for the traditional professional development for the High Scope curriculum during the 2010-2011 academic year ranged from 1 month (n = 6, 8.3%) to 11 months (n = 22, 30.5%). Two of the teachers in this academic year did not provide a response to this question. In contrast, teachers participating in the reform

professional development program for the 2011-2012 academic year attended professional development for 7 months (n = 1, 1.4%) to 11 months (n = 24, 32.4%). Thirty-one (41.9%) teachers attended reform professional development for 10 months.

During the 2010-2011 academic year, 58 (79.5%) of the 132 teachers participated in 20 or more hours of professional development. In contrast, 73 (98.6%) of the teachers participated in 20 or more hours of professional development in 2011-2012. One teacher did not provide a response regarding the number of hours spent in professional development during the 2010-2011 academic year.

The majority of participants who attended the traditional professional development (n = 70, 94.6%) reported they attended in-district workshops for their training. Forty-four (59.5%) of participants in the reform professional development program attended in-district workshops, while 30 (40.5%) reported they attended more than one source of professional development training.

The span of training for the traditional professional development program lasted from less than 1 day (n = 4, 5.4%) to more than 1 month (n = 44, 59.5%). In the reform professional development program, the span of training lasted from less than 1 day (n = 4, 5.4%) to more than 1 month (n = 60, 81.0%).

Engagement in Training

The participants were asked to indicate their engagement in the training, including listening, discussing demonstrations, leading whole group, leading small group, modeling, and communicating with the leader. The comparisons between the traditional and reform professional development program responses were presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency Distributions – Engagement in Professional Development

Engagement in Professional Development	Type of Professional Development Program			
	Traditional (2010-2011)		Reform (2011-2012)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Listened	70	94.6	72	97.3
Discussed demonstration	45	60.8	64	86.5
Led whole group	5	6.8	9	12.2
Led small group	15	20.3	34	45.9
Modeled	17	23.0	41	55.4
Communicated with leader	49	66.2	64	86.5

The majority of teachers in both the traditional (n = 70, 94.6%) and reform (n = 72, 97.3%) professional development programs indicated they listened in professional development. Forty-five (60.8%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 64 (86.5%) in the reform professional development program discussed demonstrations. A greater number of teachers in the reform professional development program (n = 9, 12.2%) than in the traditional professional development program (n = 5, 6.8%) led the whole group. Thirty-four (45.9%) teachers in the reform professional development program and 15 (20.3%) teachers in the reform professional development program indicated they led small groups. Among the teachers who modeled what they learned in their professional development programs were 17 (23.0%) teachers in the traditional program and 41 (55.4%) teachers in the reform program. Forty-nine (66.2%) teachers in the traditional program and 64 (86.5%) teachers in the reform program reported they communicated with the leader.

The participants were asked to indicate the types of feedback or guidance received as part of the professional development in the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012

academic years. The teachers were given a list of nine possible types of feedback or guidance that were received. As the teachers were asked to check all that applied to them, the number of responses exceeded the number of participants. Table 8 presented results of these analyses.

Table 8

Frequency Distributions – Type of Feedback and Guidance Received as part of Professional Development

Type of feedback and guidance received as part of professional development	Type of Professional Development Program			
	Traditional (2010-2011)		Reform (2011-2012)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Practiced under simulated conditions, with feedback	25	33.8	37	50.0
Received coaching or mentoring in the classroom	35	47.3	50	67.6
Met formally with other activity participants to discuss classroom implementation	33	44.6	45	60.8
My teaching was observed by the activity leader(s) and feedback was provided	37	50.0	58	78.4
My teaching was observed by other participants and feedback was provided	13	17.6	19	25.7
Communicated with the leader(s) of the activity concerning classroom implementation	38	51.4	59	79.7
My students' work was reviewed by participants or the activity leader	16	21.6	30	40.5
Met informally with other participants to discuss classroom implementation	44	59.5	56	75.7
Developed lesson plans, which other participants or activity leader reviewed	26	35.1	35	47.3
None	7	9.5	1	1.4

The comparison of the responses regarding the types of feedback and guidance received as part of the professional development between the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years revealed greater interaction in the 2011-2012 academic year. For example, in the 2010-2011 academic year, 38 (51.4%) indicated they had communicated with the leader(s) of the activity concerning classroom implementation. A substantially higher number of teachers (n = 59, 79.7%) reported participation in this activity during the 2011-2012 academic year. An interesting change was 7 (9.5%) teachers in the 2010-2011 academic year reported having no participation in any of the activities. This number was reduced to 1 (1.4%) teacher in the 2011-2012 academic year.

Professional Development Evaluation

The teachers in the two professional development programs responded to questions regarding the evaluation component of their programs. Their responses to these questions were presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Frequency Distributions – Professional Development Evaluation

Evaluation of Professional Development	Type of Professional Development Program			
	Traditional (2010-2011)		Reform (2011-2012)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Survey	55	74.3	68	91.9
Interview	5	6.8	12	16.2
Session observed by an outside evaluator	12	16.2	12	16.2
Class observed	31	41.9	52	70.3
Student outcomes	9	12.2	14	18.9

A greater number of participants in the reform professional development program (n = 68, 91.9%) than in the traditional professional development program (n = 55, 74.3%) completed surveys to evaluate their sessions. Five (6.8%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 12 (16.2%) teachers in the reform professional development program completed interviews as part of the evaluation. Twelve (16.2%) teachers in both the traditional and reform professional development programs indicated their sessions were observed by an outside evaluator. Thirty-one (41.9%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 52 (70.3%) teachers in the reform professional development program reported having their classes observed by the presenter. Evaluations of student outcomes were reported by 9 (12.2%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 14 (18.9%) teachers in the reform professional development program.

The participants were asked to indicate which types of materials or assistance they received from the early childhood specialists. Their responses were summarized for teachers in both the traditional and reform professional development programs. The results of these analyses were presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Frequency Distributions –Professional Development Materials and Assistance

Professional Development Materials and Assistance from Early Childhood Specialist	Type of Professional Development Program			
	Traditional (2010-2011)		Reform (2011-2012)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Materials	62	83.8	63	85.1
Assistance with classroom environment	37	50.0	44	59.5
Monitoring and feedback	40	54.1	49	66.2

Modeling process in classroom	23	31.1	24	32.4
Alignment of activities with requirements	13	17.6	19	25.7
Regular site visits by early childhood specialist	20	27.0	28	37.8
Frequent phone/email communication by early childhood specialist	51	68.9	60	81.1

The majority of teachers in both the traditional professional development program (n = 62, 83.8%) and the reform professional development program (n = 63, 85.1%) reported having received materials from the early childhood specialist. Thirty-seven (50.0%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 44 (59.5%) teachers in the reform professional development program received assistance with the classroom environment. Monitoring and feedback as a form of assistance from the early childhood specialist were reported by 40 (54.1%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 49 (66.2%) teachers in the reform professional development program. Twenty-three (31.1%) participants in the traditional professional development program and 24 (32.4%) in the reform professional development program received assistance from the modeling process in their classrooms. Assistance with aligning activities with requirements were reported by 13 (17.6%) of the participants in the traditional professional development program and 19 (25.7%) teachers in the reform professional development program. Twenty (27.0%) participants in the traditional professional development program and 28 (37.8%) teachers in the reform professional development program indicated they received regular site visits by the early childhood specialist. Fifty-one (68.9%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 60 (81.1%) teachers in the reform professional development program received frequent phone/email communication from the early childhood specialist.

The participants responded to a group of items regarding barriers to implementing the High Scope curriculum. Their responses were summarized by traditional and reform professional development programs using frequency distributions. Table 11 presented results of these analyses.

Table 11

Frequency Distributions – Barriers to Implementation of High Scope Curriculum

Barriers to Implementation of High Scope Curriculum	Type of Professional Development Program			
	Traditional (2010-2011)		Reform (2011-2012)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Unsupportive administration	15	21.1	12	16.2
Lack of adequate staff	22	32.4	30	40.5
Lack of understanding of High Scope	24	34.3	8	10.8
Lack of Central Office staff support	13	18.6	8	10.8
High Scope does not prepare for kindergarten	27	38.0	18	24.3
Difficult with school schedule	15	22.4	8	10.8
Lack of strategies to collect anecdotal notes	20	29.9	13	17.6
Change in teaching assignment or team	12	17.9	11	14.9
Do not like High Scope program	11	15.9	11	14.9

Fifteen (21.1%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 12 (16.2%) teachers in the reform professional development program indicated that unsupportive administration was a barrier to implementation of the High Scope curriculum. Lack of adequate staff was indicated by 22 (32.4%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 30 (40.5%) teachers in the reform professional development program. Twenty-four (34.3%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 8 (10.8%) teachers in the reform professional development program indicated they lacked understanding of the High Scope curriculum. Lack of central office staff support was indicated as a barrier to the implementation of the High Scope curriculum by 13 (18.6%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 8 (10.8%) teachers in the reform professional development program. Twenty-seven (38.0%) teachers in the traditional professional

development program and 18 (24.3%) teachers in the reform professional development program indicated that High Scope did not prepare children for kindergarten. Implementation of the program was considered difficult with the school schedule by 15 (22.4%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 8 (10.8%) teachers in the reform professional development program. Twenty (29.9%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 13 (17.6%) teachers in the reform professional development program reported that a lack of strategies to collect anecdotal notes was a barrier to implementation of the High Scope curriculum. Change in teaching assignment or team was a barrier to implementing the High Scope curriculum by 12 (17.9%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 11 (14.9%) teachers in the reform professional development program. Eleven (15.9%) teachers in the traditional professional development program and 11 (14.9%) teachers in the reform professional development program did not like the High Scope curriculum.

Research Hypotheses

Three research hypotheses were developed for this study. Each of these hypotheses were tested using inferential statistical analyses. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using a criterion alpha level of .05.

H_1: Reform professional development will result in higher implementation of instructional strategies that support adult-child interaction than traditional professional development.

To test these hypotheses, t-tests for dependent samples were used to compare responses from participants in the traditional professional development program and participants in the reform professional development program on adult-child interactions. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

t-Tests for Dependent Samples: Adult-Child Interactions by Type of Professional Development Program

	Number	Mean	SD	DF	t	Sig
Adult-child interactions						
Traditional	74	31.23	4.68	73	-9.38	<.001
Reform	74	34.85	3.99			

The comparison of the teachers in traditional professional development program (m = 31.23, sd = 4.68) and teachers in the reform professional development program (m = 34.85, sd = 3.99) were statistically significant, t (73) = -9.38, p < .001. Based on these findings, the null hypothesis is rejected. Teachers in the reform professional development program appear to have more positive responses regarding adult-child interactions.

H_2: Reform professional development will result in higher implementation of High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum than traditional professional development.

A t-test for dependent samples was used to determine if perceptions of the High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum differed between participants in the traditional and reform professional development programs. Table 13 presents results of these analyses.

Table 13

t-Tests for Dependent Samples: Daily Routine by Type of Professional Development Program

	Number	Mean	SD	DF	t	Sig
Daily Routine						
Traditional	72	65.92	9.02	71	-4.96	<.001
Reform	72	70.68	5.73			

The second comparison of the daily routine between teachers in the traditional professional development program (m = 65.92, sd = 9.02) and teachers in the reform professional development program (m = 70.68, sd = 5.73) was statistically significant, t (71) = -4.96, p < .001. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis of no difference is rejected. Teachers in the reform professional development program have more positive perceptions regarding the High Scope "Daily Routine."

H_3: Reform professional development will result in higher implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment than the traditional professional development.

To test differences in perceptions of the High Scope classroom learning environment, t-tests for dependent samples were used. The same teachers participated in both professional development programs. The professional development programs being compared were the traditional professional development program and the reform professional development program. Table 14 presents results of this analysis.

Table 14

t-Tests for Dependent Samples: Learning Environment by Type of Professional Development Program

	Number	Mean	SD	DF	t	Sig
Learning Environment						
Traditional	73	25.95	3.16	72	-5.49	<.001
Reform	73	27.74	2.26			

The results of the comparison of responses on the learning environment between teachers in the traditional professional development program (m = 25.95, sd = 3.16) and teachers in the reform professional development program (m = 27.74, sd = 2.26) was statistically significant, t (72) = -5.49, p < .001. The significant results provide evidence that support rejection of the null hypothesis. Teachers in the reform professional development program appear to have more positive perceptions of the learning environment.

Ancillary Findings

Four comparisons were made for time spent, knowledge and skills, preparation, and confidence between teachers in the traditional and reform professional development programs. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

t-Tests for Dependent Samples: Time Spent, Knowledge and Skills, Preparation, and Confidence by Type of Professional Development Program

	Number	Mean	SD	DF	t	Sig
Time Spent						
Traditional	74	17.36	5.69	73	-6.05	<.001
Reform	74	21.43	3.78			
Knowledge and Skills						
Traditional	73	14.90	3.31	72	-6.00	<.001
Reform	73	17.15	2.55			
Preparation for High Scope Curriculum						
Traditional	71	13.52	4.04	70	-8.42	<.001
Reform	71	17.17	2.47			
Confidence						
Traditional	74	14.32	3.62	73	-7.59	<.001
Reform	74	17.39	2.35			

The comparison of teachers in the traditional professional development program (m = 17.36, sd = 5.69) and teachers in the reform professional development program (m = 21.43, sd = 3.78) for time spent in professional development was statistically significant, t (73) = - 6.05, p < .001. When knowledge and skills learned in professional development were compared between the traditional professional development program (m = 14.90, sd = 3.31) and reform professional development program (m = 17.15, sd = 2.55), the difference was statistically significant. Teachers in the traditional professional development program (m = 13.52, sd = 4.04) and teachers in the reform professional development program (m = 17.17, sd = 2.47) differed in classroom curriculum preparation, t (70) = -8.42, p < .001. The comparison of confidence between teachers in the traditional professional development program (m = 14.32, sd = 3.62) and those in the reform professional development program (m = 17.39, sd = 2.35) was statistically significant, t (73) = -7.59, p < .001. These differences indicated that participating in the

reform professional development program appears to have better prepared the teachers in regard to knowledge and skills, preparation for the High Scope curriculum, and confidence.

Summary

The results of the data analysis describing the participants and their participation in professional development programs, as well as the results of the hypotheses testing have been presented in this chapter. Conclusions and recommendations based on these results are located in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

High quality staff development is essential if teachers are to effectively teach basic academic skills, a prerequisite to raising student achievement. An emphasis on basic skills has become particularly important given the increasing technology-driven nature of the job market (Danielson, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 2001; Darling-Hammond & Young, 2002). Research on student achievement concluded that high quality staff development activities are a critical determinant on success (Given, 2005).

Professional development has been presented in several different formats, including, but not limited to lecture (sit and listen) or other forms of non-interactive activities. Staff development is essential, but must be substantially different from the approach taken in the past if it is to produce high levels of learning for students and staff members (Jones, 1998; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997).

As explained in Chapter 1, there were three purposes for this study. The first purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between traditional-conventional professional development versus high quality reform reflective professional development and curriculum implementation of classroom practices. Secondly, the study examined the association between certain types of professional development activities and increased levels of curriculum implementation. Finally, the study investigated if there was a statistically significant difference in curriculum implementation, teacher knowledge, and changes to teaching practices based upon the type of professional development that teachers have experienced.

The study used survey methodology to investigate traditional professional development versus reform professional development and the impact on prekindergarten teachers' instructional strategies. The survey was adapted from "The Globe Teacher Survey on Professional Development" (Penuel et al., 2007). Portions of the professional development were designed by the High Scope Foundation in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Based on the literature, the greatest frustration for school leaders and classroom educators is the difference between what we know and what we do (Reeves, 2010). It was assumed that teaching staff could quickly learn the curriculum to implement with fidelity. According to Knapp (2003), learning refers to demonstrable changes in teachers' knowledge, skills, beliefs, and commitments. Learning also can refer to changes in practice. If teachers are expected to use classroom strategies that encourage teacher-child interaction, Bandura's (1977) social learning theory requires that the teachers first must observe and model the prescribed behaviors, and notice the attitudes and reactions they get from others. As elaborated on in Chapter 1, Bandura (1977) claimed that there were four essential components for learning to occur effectively, and in this case, in the context of professional development. These components included:

1. Paying attention to events, this depends in large part on the observer's own characteristics,
2. Retaining, organizing, and rehearsing the observed behavior,
3. Actually reproducing the behavior, and
4. Possessing the motivation, both extrinsically and intrinsically to act.

A closer examination of these four conditions provided theoretical support for reform professional development and the effective implementation of the High Scope Curriculum using newly-learned strategies.

Findings

A total of 132 Detroit Great Start Readiness Prekindergarten Program teachers participated in the traditional professional development program in the 2010-2011 academic year. The same 132 teachers then participated in a reform professional development program during the 2011-2012 academic years. The teachers were asked to complete a survey at the end of the 2011-2012 academic year that was designed around their participation in both types of professional development. Of the 132 teachers, 74 completed and returned their surveys for a response rate 56.1%.

The majority of the participants were female, and African American. Most teachers had obtained master degrees and had been teaching for 12 years or more. The teachers had been in prekindergarten classrooms for 8 years and more. The schools that were included in the study were in a large urban school district. The grade distribution was prekindergarten through 5th grade or prekindergarten through 8th grade. The schools either had 1 to 2 or 3 to 5 High Scope teachers assigned to the schools. The number of students participating in the preschool program in the schools ranged from 16 to more than 48.

The participants spent 1 to 11 months in traditional professional development during the 2010-2011 academic year and from 7 to 11 months in the reform professional development. The number of hours spent in traditional professional development was from 4 to 20 or more hours, while almost all teachers spent 20 or more hours in reform professional development during the 2011-2012 academic year. While most of the

teachers attended traditional professional development at in-district workshops, many of the teachers in the reform professional development attended more than one source during the 2011-2012 academic year. The span of training for both the traditional and reform professional development programs was greater than one month.

The teachers were asked about engagement in professional development programs. The majority of the teachers indicated that in both the traditional and reform programs they listened, with more teachers in the reform program indicating they discussed demonstrations, led whole group, led small group, modeled, and communicated with the leader than they did while in the traditional professional development program.

The teachers were asked to indicate the types of feedback and guidance they received as part of their professional development programs. The teachers reported that in the reform professional development program they were more likely to receive feedback and guidance in all areas, including coaching or mentoring, formal meetings with other activity participants to discuss classroom implementation, communicated with the leader(s) of the activity concerning classroom implementation, and met informally with other participants to discuss classroom implementation. The majority of participants indicated they evaluated the professional development programs using surveys, with more participants indicating they were interviewed and their classes were observed when participating in the reform professional development programs.

The participants received materials and assistance in both the traditional and reform professional development programs. They indicated they were more likely to receive assistance with the classroom environment, monitoring and feedback, alignment of activities with requirements, regular site visits by early childhood specialist, and

frequent phone/email communication by early childhood specialist when participating in the reform professional development program. Teachers, who participated in the traditional professional development program, were more likely to identify unsupportive administration, lack of understanding of High Scope, High Scope did not prepare for kindergarten, difficulty with school schedule, and a lack of strategies to collect anecdotal notes as barriers to implementation of the High Scope Curriculum.

Research hypotheses

Three research hypotheses were developed for this study. Each of these hypotheses were tested using t-tests for dependent samples. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using a criterion alpha level of .05.

H_1: Reform Professional Development will result in higher implementation of instructional strategies that support adult-child interaction than Traditional Professional Development.

H_{01}: Reform Professional Development will not result in higher implementation of instructional strategies that support adult-child interaction than Traditional Professional Development.

The comparison of adult-child interactions for the traditional professional development program and the reform professional development program was statistically significant. The teachers rated the reform professional development program higher than the traditional professional development program regarding adult-child interactions.

H_2: Reform Professional Development will result in higher implementation of High Scope “Daily Routine” curriculum than Traditional Professional Development. H_{02}: Reform Professional Development will not result in

higher implementation of High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum than Traditional Professional Development.

The comparison of scores for the High Scope "Daily Routine" curriculum between the traditional professional development program and the reform professional development program was statistically significant. This finding provided evidence that teachers who attended both types of professional development programs gave the reform professional development significantly higher ratings than the traditional professional development program.

H_3: Reform Professional Development will result in higher implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment than the Traditional Professional Development.

H_{03}: Reform Professional Development will not result in higher implementation of the High Scope classroom learning environment than the Traditional Professional Development.

The results of the t-test for dependent samples comparing teachers' rating for the High Scope classroom learning environment differed significantly between the traditional professional development and reform professional development. The teachers rated the reform professional development program significantly higher than the traditional professional development program.

Ancillary findings

Four comparisons were made for time spent, knowledge and skills, preparation, and confidence between the traditional and reform professional development programs. For each of the four comparisons, the teachers rated the reform professional

development program significantly higher than the traditional professional development program.

Conclusions

According to Karp (2006), if society is going to close the achievement gap, a professional development curricula and models have to be developed for early childhood programs. These programs could be used to prepare teachers who can then prepare children to succeed. The State of Michigan and the Great Start Readiness Program mandates professional development to support curriculum implementation. Traditional professional development for teachers has often been ineffective in bringing desired changes (Jones, 1998; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997). Policy makers, educators, and society as a whole need to address the policies and implementation issues related to professional development related to early childhood. Creating a seamless system of both high quality early childhood care and education and high quality early childhood, professional development programs is essential (Karp, 2006).

Differences in the ways that the two types of professional development programs were presented contributed to the more positive ratings for the reform professional development. The reform professional development program encouraged individual participation and provided feedback that was missing in the traditional professional development programs. The smaller groups allowed for personalized attention in the training session and in the classroom, as compared to traditional professional development that supported large group training. Several participants included comments regarding the size of the group in their evaluation:

- I like the smaller groups for professional development.

- Hold more of these workshops with these same numbers, large enough, but not too large that I'm distracted, not too small that it feels confusing. 4-5 trainers, all on the same message, but different perspectives. Keep Em' Coming!
- Continue great workshops!

Traditional professional development favored "paid presenters;" whereas, reform professional development had a consistent presenter who also provided observation feedback in the classroom to the participants. Participants also requested the following:

- Just continue observing me in the classroom and giving feedback!
- Provide continued opportunities for High Scope in-service,
- Offer more training often (to reinforce, check on our progress), and
- Continue to make classroom visits.

According to Garet et al. (2001), reform professional development demands much of teachers. These types of activities are likely to be more effective because they are led by current classroom teachers who other teachers trust as a source of meaningful guidance on improving teaching. The Early Childhood Specialists (ECS) were former prekindergarten teachers who were promoted in 2010. They had a close connection to the classroom and challenges encountered by the classroom staff. The classroom teams felt the ECS could relate to these challenges, and the lead and associate teachers were comfortable requesting classroom support or asking questions during professional development. High Scope Curriculum implementation in the prekindergarten classroom increased with the reform professional development, compared to the traditional professional development. Keeping the team (teacher and associate teacher) together for all reform professional development programs was

favored by the teachers as additional classroom support. They appreciated having the team experience. Training the classroom team together was highly effectively and supportive of the curriculum implementation. Furthermore, teachers often reported participating as a group in professional development could give focus to collegial interactions and motivate the team working collaboratively through problems of practice (Little, 1993). Additional comments the participants included in the evaluation were:

- My favorite session was “Do You Have SOUL”? Large Group Time and Small Group Time helped us to improve significantly in those areas. Our large group has become more children led. We have used more of the Small Group ideas presented by our colleagues.
- Professional Development with hands-on activities helped me to better understand High Scope.
- We are making better choices on how to plan small group effectively,
- We’re implementing less directive, more active learning opportunities for children,
- We are using the appropriate language during small group,
- Having my associate teacher in the session with me is wonderful, that allows us to hear the information at the same time and sometimes we have discussions about what she heard and what I heard.
- We are implementing activities that promote the elements of active learning during the small group period,
- I learned more today about being active, supportive, the five elements of active learning, and promoting scaffolding, than last year (traditional professional development).

The findings of this professional development study compared traditional professional development and reform professional development supported an increase in the classroom implementation of the curriculum, the daily routine, the classroom environment and the adult – child interaction. Ensuring adequate time to plan, the necessary materials, supporting professional development, classroom observation-feedback and supportive administration prepared staff to implement the curriculum with success, increasing the academic success of the students. Garet et al. (2001) also found significant correlations between the type of activity, time span, and coherence, on one hand, and changes in knowledge and practice on the other, just as the earlier studies did, also giving teachers time to plan for implementation was important for helping teachers integrate the materials into their curriculum.

Study Limitations

While the study showed the reform professional development as statistically significant and supported the three hypotheses, some limitations needed to be explained. Although the reform professional development was conducted the year after the traditional professional development, participants had no way of knowing they would be asked to compare the two types of programs. The prekindergarten teachers had to rely on retrospective memory related to the traditional professional development for comparison to the reform professional development. A second limitation was the selection of participants. Although, two other prekindergarten programs were operating in the school district, the prekindergarten program with the largest number of teachers was selected. This group was assigned to a program which had recently undergone an audit and the traditional professional development was an effort to correct an audit finding. The traditional format was not producing effective implementation of the new

curriculum. The reform professional development was an attempt to reconcile the audit finding. Using only one of the prekindergarten programs could reduce the generalizability of the research findings. A third limitation was the absence of the associate teachers' response to the survey questions. They were an integral component of the reform professional development and were a part of the cohort teams. The associate teachers attended all of the reform professional development training with their assigned teacher, received and requested feedback regarding curriculum implementation strategies in the classroom. The GSRP associate teachers' understanding and support of the curriculum also influenced instructional strategies and implementation of High Scope in the prekindergarten classroom.

Educational Implications

Professional development is a major component of supporting classroom teachers with curriculum implementation. The format of professional development could either support or impede teacher implementation of the High Scope curriculum. This study has the potential to yield findings that point to effective ways to use professional development funds and time in preparing teachers to be more effective. Based on the research, effective reform professional development is supportive of standards-based teaching and student gains. Since teachers across the country must participate in professional development yearly, this study's findings could find wide-spread applicability to universal problems in supporting teacher implementation of curriculum.

Recommendations for Future Research

Recommendations for further research could find widespread applicability to universal problems in supporting teacher implementation of the High Scope curriculum. Some suggestions for future research include:

- Replicate the present study using input from the associate teacher using the teacher survey on reform and traditional professional development to assess their perceptions of which program was more useful in implementing a new curriculum.
- Conduct a comparison study between Head Start and GSRP teachers on curriculum implementation following the traditional professional development of the Head Start staff and the reform professional development of the GSRP staff to determine the effect of curriculum implementation on student achievement.
- Conduct a comparison study using the data from teachers who received traditional only and a second group of teachers who participated in reform professional development to determine which format influenced improvement in student achievement.
- Use an experimental research study to determine the effects of participation in traditional and reform professional development programs on job satisfaction, teacher efficacy, and retention in position among Head Start and GSRP teachers.

APPENDIX A

Survey

Professional Development Teacher Survey

Teacher Survey

on Professional Development

(2010-2012)

For questions regarding this survey, contact Helen Oliver-Brooks (877) 888-8973

The survey you are about to complete is designed to provide a detailed description of your experiences in professional development with the High Scope Curriculum 2010-2012 academic year. In addition, the classroom implementation will also be explored. We will begin by asking about the entire variety of High Scope-related professional development in which you participated during 2010-2011, and then switch to 2011-2012 professional development experiences for the remainder of the survey.

Please make certain that your answer refers to the professional development experience being asked about in each question.

We have tested this survey with some teachers and they took about 30 minutes to complete the survey. Please indicate all responses by writing an "X" in the appropriate box(es) or writing your reply.

Part I: Your Overall Professional Development

1. **These first five questions are about *your 2010-2011 professional development training* in High Scope. Mark [X] for all of the months you participated in professional development training in High Scope?** ☐ *Not applicable-Did not participate*

Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June
2011	2010	2010	2010	2010	2010	2011	2011	2011	2011	2011
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. **Was your professional development training part of:**
   - ☐ a. An in-district workshop or institute?
   - ☐ b. A college course?
   - ☐ c. An out-of-district workshop or institute?
   - ☐ d. An out-of-district conference (MiAEYC, NAEYC, HIGH SCOPE FOUNDATION, ETC.)?
   - ☐ e. Other
   - ☐ f. ☐ *Not applicable-Did not participate*

3. **Between September 2010 and June 2011, including the High Scope Workshops and any preliminary activities or formal follow-up to implementation sessions, how many hours were you engaged in Professional Development overall?** ☐ *Not applicable-Did not participate*

   - ☐ 0-3 Hours
   - ☐ 4-7 Hours
   - ☐ 8-11 Hours
   - ☐ 12-15 Hours
   - ☐ 16-19 Hours
   - ☐ More than 20 Hours

4. **Over what period of time did the (2010-2011) professional development occur, including the main experience and any follow-up to implementation sessions? (Mark [X] one box.)** ☐ *Not applicable - Did not participate.*

   - ☐ a. Less than one day
   - ☐ b. One day
   - ☐ c. Two-four days
   - ☐ d. One week
   - ☐ e. One month
   - ☐ f. More than one month

5. Which of the following describes (you) the participant in the 2010-2011 professional development? (Mark all that apply.) □ *Not applicable-Did not participate*

- □ a. Listened to a lecture or presentation
- □ b. Discussed demonstration of a lesson, unit, or skill
- □ c. Led a whole-group discussion
- □ d. Led a small-group discussion
- □ e. Modeled a lesson, unit or skill
- □ f. Communicated with the leader

6. Three or more hours was given to each of the following as part of ongoing professional development in 2010-2011? (Mark [X] one box for each line.) □ *Not applicable-Did not participate*

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Hands-on practice using High Scope	□	□	□	□	□
Ways to integrate High Scope with state/regional/national standards	□	□	□	□	□
Ways to integrate High Scope with state/national standards	□	□	□	□	□
Classroom implementation planning	□	□	□	□	□
Mentoring/feedback on implementation steps taken between training sessions	□	□	□	□	□

7. What kinds of feedback or guidance did you receive as part of the 2010-2011 professional development? (Mark [X] all that applies) □ *Not applicable-Did not participate*

- □ a. Practiced under simulated conditions, with feedback
- □ b. Received coaching or mentoring in the classroom
- □ c. Met formally with other activity participants to discuss classroom implementation
- □ d. My teaching was observed by the activity leader(s) and feedback was provided
- □ e. My teaching was observed by other participants and feedback was provided
- □ f. Communicated with the leader(s) of the activity concerning classroom implementation
- □ g. My students' work was reviewed by participants or the activity leader
- □ h. Met informally with other participants to discuss classroom implementation
- □ i. Developed lesson plans, which other participants or activity leader reviewed
- □ j. None

8. How was the professional development evaluated for 2010-2011? (Mark [X] all that applies.) *☐Not applicable-Did not participate*

- ☐ Participants completed a survey
- ☐ Participants were interviewed to provide feedback
- ☐ The session was observed by an evaluator
- ☐ My classroom was observed
- ☐ Student outcomes in my classroom were evaluated
- ☐ Some other form of evaluation took place (specify):
- ☐ No discernible evaluation took place

Part II: What Are the Outcomes of Professional Development Experience?

This section of the survey is about High Scope professional development experiences. It focuses on the *impact* of the professional development on *you* and *your students.*

9. To what extent do you feel that your knowledge and skills have been enhanced in each of the following areas as a result of your participation in the 2010-2011 professional development?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Curriculum (Implementing/ Supplementing)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Instructional Methods/Strategies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Assessment (On-Line COR)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. High Scope Program Assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

10. Think about the High Scope professional development experience you have participated in 2010-2011, mark [X] the box that best shows how much you agree or disagree with each statement. *☐Not applicable-Did not participate*

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. The professional development prepared me to implement the High Scope Philosophy with my students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. The professional development prepared me to implement High Scope learning activities with my students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. The professional development prepared me to adapt High Scope to the ability levels and learning styles of my students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. The professional development prepared me to	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

adapt High Scope to state/local standards.

11. To what extent did the 2010-2011 professional development increase your knowledge and/or confidence in each of the following areas? (Mark [X] one box for each line.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Deepening your knowledge/understanding of High Scope	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Implementing the High Scope Philosophy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Suggesting/assisting the planning of classroom activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Collecting assessment data (anecdotal notes)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

12. To what extent have you made each of the following changes in your teaching practices as a result of the High Scope professional development in 2010-2011? (Mark [X] one box for each practice.). ☐*Not applicable-Did not participate.*

Questions "a-h" support ADULT-CHILD INTERACTION	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Adults use some strategies to support communication with children whose primary language is not English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Adults asks children questions sparingly, questions are open-ended and relate to what children are doing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Adults participate as partners and use a variety of strategies in children's play	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Adults encourage children to explore and use a variety of materials in individual ways and at their own pace	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Adults support children when they choose to repeat an activity multiple times (daily, weekly, monthly, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Adults find many opportunities to refer children to one another and support spontaneous efforts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Adults support children with problem					

solving and being independent	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Adults support children in identifying the problem and choosing a solution	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Questions "i – x" support DAILY ROUTINE					
i. Adults and children follow a consistent daily routine and refer to the parts of the day by name	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. The daily routine is posted and in at least two forms (for children and adults)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Children are actively engaged and have an appropriate amount of time for each part of the day	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. There is a daily planning time for children to indicate their plans to adults	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Adults use a range of strategies (props) to support children's planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. All areas and materials are available to children for making plans	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. Adults support children's choices about where and how to use materials and carry out activities (taking materials from one area to another).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p. There is a daily time set aside for the teaching staff to recall and reflect on the children's activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
q. Adults use a variety of strategies to encourage children to recall their experiences and share with the class.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
r. There is a daily time set aside for small group activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
s. Adults stay with the same small group for at least 2 months	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
t. Throughout large group time, children contribute their own ideas and participate at their own level	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
u. Adults encourage children to make choices	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

during transition time (how to move, who to partner with, etc.)					
v. Meals are served family-styled and children have choices (what to eat, how much, who to sit next to, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
x. Children go outside daily and have choices about how to play (climbing, jumping, running, alone or with others)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Questions "y – dd" support the LEARNING ENVIRONMENT					
y. Children are given choices of quiet activities at rest-time (books, puzzles, paper/crayons, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
z. The classroom space is divided into interest areas (blocks, toy, book, sand/water, art, house, building, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
aa. The location of the interest areas allows for multiple children to play at once and space to move freely	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
bb. Classroom materials are grouped by function, open-ended, plentiful, labeled and easily accessible to children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
cc. Materials include many "real" items in place of toy replicas and reflect the home and community cultures and special needs of program children (e.g. photos of family members, cooking utensils, music tapes, work clothes, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
dd. A variety of children's work is displayed consisting of authentic "child initiated" work (this does not include commercial or cookie cutter art)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Part III: General Information about High Scope Implementation

This section is about Program Support in general, and is no longer focused only on professional development.

13. What kinds of support has an Early Childhood Specialist partner provided for you in

2010-2011? (Mark (X) all that apply)

- ☐ a. Received curriculum/classroom materials and some supplemental supplies
- ☐ b. Assistance on classroom arrangement and environment feedback
- ☐ c. Monitoring with observation and feedback on High Scope Implementation
- ☐ d. Modeling processes and interactions (in the classroom)
- ☐ e. Alignment of activities with state and local curriculum or accountability requirements
- ☐ f. Regular (1-2 times per month) site visits by Early Childhood Specialist
- ☐ g. Frequent contact with Early Childhood Specialist via phone or email

14. What additional support would have facilitated your successful implementation of High Scope in 2010-2011?

_____

_____

15. How important was each of the following potential barriers in keeping you from implementing High Scope with your students in 2010-2011? (Mark [X] one box for each barrier.)

	Disagree	**Neutral**	**Agree**
a. Unsupportive Administrators	☐	☐	☐
b. Lack of adequate staffing	☐	☐	☐
c. Lack of understanding of High Scope Implementation	☐	☐	☐
d. Lack of support from central office support staff	☐	☐	☐
e. High Scope does not prepare students adequately for kindergarten	☐	☐	☐
f. Difficulty completing routine activities within the school schedule	☐	☐	☐
g. Lack of a good strategies to collect anecdotal notes	☐	☐	☐
h. Change in teaching assignment or team members	☐	☐	☐
i. Do not like the High Scope Program	☐	☐	☐

16. If you answered "2010-2011" on question 4 (a), to what extent have you made each of the following changes in your teaching practices as a result of the professional development? (Mark [X] one box for each line.)

	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**

a. The instructional methods I employ	□	□	□	□
b. The types of mixed assessments tools I use to evaluate students' work	□	□	□	□
c. The ways I use technology in instruction	□	□	□	□
d. The approaches I take to meet the needs of diverse students	□	□	□	□

17. These next five questions are about *your 2011-2012 professional development training* in High Scope. Mark [X] for all of the months you participated in professional development training in High Scope? □ *Not applicable-Did not participate-skip number7*

Aug 2011	Sep 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	June 2012
□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□

18. Was your professional development training part of:

□ a. An in-district workshop or institute?
□ b. A college course?
□ c. An out-of-district workshop or institute?
□ d. An out-of-district conference (MiAEYC, NAEYC, HIGH SCOPE FOUNDATION, ETC.)
□ e. Other

19. Between September 2011 and June 2012, including the High Scope Workshops and any preliminary activities or formal follow-up to implementation sessions, how many hours were you engaged in Professional Development overall? □ *Not applicable-Did not participate.*

□ 0-3 Hours
□ 4-7 hours
□ 8-11 Hours
□ 12-15 Hours
□ 16-19 Hours
□ More than 20 Hours

20. Over what period of time did the (2011-2012) professional development occur, including the main experience and any follow-up sessions? (Mark [X] one box.) □

Not applicable-Did not participate.

- □ Less than one day
- □ One day
- □ Two to four days
- □ One week
- □ One month
- □ More than one month

21. Which of the following did YOU engage in or do during the 2011-2012 professional development? □*Not applicable-Did not participate*

- □ Listened to a lecture or presentation
- □ Discussed demonstration of a lesson, unit, or skill
- □ Led a whole-group discussion
- □ Led a small-group discussion
- □ Modeled a lesson, unit or skill
- □ Communicated with the leader
- □ Was actively engaged in an activity
- □ Received verbal feedback from the presenter
- □

22. Which of the following did YOU engage in or do during the 2011-2012 professional development? □*Not applicable-Did not participate*

	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
Hands-on practice using High Scope	□	□	□	□	□
Ways to integrate High Scope with state/national standards	□	□	□	□	□
Classroom Assessment (Anecdotal Notes)	□	□	□	□	□
Classroom implementation planning	□	□	□	□	□
Mentoring/feedback on implementation steps taken between training sessions	□	□	□	□	□

23. What kinds of feedback or guidance did you receive as part of the 2011-2012 professional development? (Mark [X} all that applies). □ *Not applicable-Did not participate*

□ a. Practiced under simulated conditions, with feedback
□ b. Received coaching or mentoring in the classroom
□ c. Met formally with other activity participants to discuss classroom implementation
□ d. My teaching was observed by the activity leader(s) and feedback was provided
□ e. My teaching was observed by other participants and feedback was provided
□ f. Communicated with the leader(s) of the activity concerning classroom implementation
□ g. My students' work was reviewed by participants or the activity leader
□ h. Met informally with other participants to discuss classroom implementation
□ i. Developed lesson plans, which other participants or activity leader reviewed
□ j. None

24. How was the professional development evaluated for 2011-2012? (Mark [X] all that apply).

□ *Not applicable-Did not participate*
□ Participants completed a survey
□ Participants were interviewed to provide feedback
□ The session was observed by an evaluator
□ My classroom was observed
□ Student outcomes in my classroom were evaluated
□ Some other form of evaluation took place (specify):
□ No discernible evaluation took place

Part IV: What Are the Outcomes of Professional Development Experience?

This section of the survey is about High Scope professional development experiences. It focuses on the *impact* of the professional development on *you* and *your students*.

25. To what extent do you feel that your knowledge and skills have been enhanced in each of the following areas as a result of your participation in the 2011-2012 professional development?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Curriculum (Implementing/Supplementing)	□	□	□	□	□
b. Instructional Methods/Strategies	□	□	□	□	□
c. Assessment (On-Line COR)	□	□	□	□	□
d. High Scope Program Assessment	□	□	□	□	□

26. Think about the High Scope professional development experience you have participated in 2011-2012 mark [X] the box that best shows how much you agree or disagree with each statement. □*Not applicable-Did not participate*

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. The professional development prepared me to implement the High Scope Philosophy with my students.	□	□	□	□	□
b. The professional development prepared me to implement High Scope learning activities with my students.	□	□	□	□	□
c. The professional development prepared me to adapt High Scope to the ability levels and learning styles of my students.	□	□	□	□	□
d. The professional development prepared me to adapt High Scope to state/local standards.	□	□	□	□	□

27. To what extent did the 2011-2012 professional development increase your knowledge and/or confidence in each of the following areas? (Mark [X] one box for each line.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Deepening your knowledge/understanding of High Scope	□	□	□	□	□
b. Implementing the High Scope Philosophy	□	□	□	□	□
c. Suggesting/assisting the planning of classroom activities	□	□	□	□	□
d. Collecting assessment data (anecdotal notes)	□	□	□	□	□

28. To what extent have you made each of the following changes in your teaching practices as a result of the High Scope professional development in 2011-2012? (Mark [X] one box for each practice.). □*Not applicable-Did not participate.*

Questions "a-h" support ADULT-CHILD

INTERACTION	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
a. Adults use some strategies to support communication with children whose primary language is not English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Adults asks children questions sparingly, questions are open-ended and relate to what children are doing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Adults participate as partners and use a variety of strategies in children's play	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Adults encourage children to explore and use a variety of materials in individual ways and at their own pace	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Adults support children when they choose to repeat an activity multiple times (daily, weekly, monthly, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Adults find many opportunities to refer children to one another and support spontaneous efforts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Adults support children with problem solving and being independent	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Adults support children in identifying the problem and choosing a solution	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Questions "i – x" support DAILY ROUTINE					
i. Adults and children follow a consistent daily routine and refer to the parts of the day by name	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. The daily routine is posted and in at least two forms (for children and adults)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Children are actively engaged and have an appropriate amount of time for each part of the day	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. There is a daily planning time for children to indicate their plans to adults	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Adults use a range of strategies (props) to support children's planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. All areas and materials are available to					

children for making plans	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. Adults support children's choices about where and how to use materials and carry out activities (taking materials from one area to another).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p. There is a daily time set aside for the teaching staff to recall and reflect on the children's activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
q. Adults use a variety of strategies to encourage children to recall their experiences and share with the class.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
r. There is a daily time set aside for small group activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
s. Adults stay with the same small group for at least 2 months	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
t. Throughout large group time, children contribute their own ideas and participate at their own level	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
u. Adults encourage children to make choices during transition time (how to move, who to partner with, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
v. Meals are served family-styled and children have choices (what to eat, how much, who to sit next to, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
x. Children go outside daily and have choices about how to play (climbing, jumping, running, alone or with others)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Questions "y – dd" support the LEARNING ENVIRONMENT					
y. Children are given choices of quiet activities at rest-time (books, puzzles, paper/crayons, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
z. The classroom space is divided into interest areas (blocks, toy, book, sand/water, art, house, building, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
aa. The location of the interest areas allows for multiple children to play at once and space to move freely	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

bb. Classroom materials are grouped by function, open-ended, plentiful, labeled and easily accessible to children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
cc. Materials include many "real" items in place of toy replicas and reflect the home and community cultures and special needs of program children (e.g. photos of family members, cooking utensils, music tapes, work clothes, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
dd. A variety of children's work is displayed consisting of authentic "child initiated" work (this does not include commercial or cookie cutter art)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Part V:

General Information about High Scope Implementation

This section is about Program Support in general, and is no longer focused only on professional development.

29. What kinds of support has an Early Childhood Specialist partner provided for you in 2010-2011? (Mark (X) all that apply)

- ☐ a. Received curriculum/classroom materials and some supplemental supplies
- ☐ b. Assistance on classroom arrangement and environment feedback
- ☐ c. Monitoring with observation and feedback on High Scope Implementation
- ☐ d. Modeling processes and interactions (in the classroom)
- ☐ e. Alignment of activities with state and local curriculum or accountability requirements
- ☐ f. Regular (1-2 times per month) site visits by Early Childhood Specialist
- ☐ g. Frequent contact with Early Childhood Specialist via phone or email

30. What additional support would have facilitated your successful implementation of High Scope in 2010-2011?

_____

_____

31. How important was each of the following potential barriers in keeping you from implementing High Scope with your students in 2011-2012? (Mark [X] one box for each barrier.)

- ☐ a. Unsupportive Administrators

- □ b. Lack of adequate staffing
- □ c. Lack of understanding of High Scope Implementation
- □ d. Lack of support from central office support staff
- □ e. High Scope does not prepare students adequately for kindergarten
- □ f. Difficulty completing routine activities within the school schedule
- □ g. Lack of a good strategies to collect anecdotal notes
- □ h. Change in teaching assignment or team members
- □ i. Do not like the High Scope Program

32. If you answered "2010-2011" on question 4 (a), to what extent have you made each of the following changes in your teaching practices as a result of the professional development? (Mark [X] one box for each line.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree
a. The instructional methods I employ	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. The types of mixed assessments tools I use to evaluate students' work	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. The ways I use technology in instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. The approaches I take to meet the needs of diverse students	☐	☐	☐	☐

Part VI: Demographics

33. Which category best describes your school? (If your school covers several of these categories, select the level at which students are most active in High Scope.) (Please mark [X] one):

- □ Elementary (Prekindergarten-5th grade)
- □ Elementary/Middle School (Prekindergarten – 8th grade)
- □ Middle School or Junior High (6th -8th grade)
- □ High School (9th -12th grade)

34. Which grade(s) do you teach/support High Scope? (Mark [X] all that applies.)

□ Prek □ K □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

□ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9 □10 □ 11 □ 12

35. Including yourself, how many High Scope trained teachers are assigned to your school 2011-2012?

- □ 1-2

□ 3-5
□ 6 or more

36. How many students participate in High Scope in your school each year?

□ 16
□ 32
□ 48

More than 48

37. "During the time BETWEEN the 2010-11 professional development and the fall of 2011, how many hours did you spend furthering your learning about High Scope instructional strategies through reading, conferences, videos, or course work on your own time?
_____ hours". (Mark [X] one box). □ *Not applicable-Did not participate.*

	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
a. At the beginning of last year's High Scope professional development (2010-2011), I would characterize my attitude and motivation to implement the program as *positive.*	□	□	□	□	□
b. At the beginning of the current year's High Scope professional development (2011-2012), I would characterize my attitude and motivation to implement the program as *positive.*	□	□	□	□	□

38. What is your gender? (Mark [X] one.)

□ Female □ Male

39. Please indicate your ethnicity/race. (Mark [X] one.)

□ American Indian or Alaskan Native
□ Asian or Pacific Islander
□ African American, not of Hispanic origin
□ White, not of Hispanic origin
□ Hispanic
□ Other (please specify): _____

40. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

□ 0 - 2 □ 3 - 5 □ 6 - 8 □ 8 - 11 □ 12 – or more

41. How many years of *prekindergarten* teaching/work experience do you have?

☐ 0 - 2 ☐ 3 - 5 ☐ 6 - 8 ☐ 8 - 11 ☐ 12 – or more

42. Please fill in the box (es) next to the degree(s) you hold. Use the list of code numbers from below to indicate your major fields of study for each degree.

Post-secondary Degree	Major Field	Certifications	Endorsements	Enter year of Degree/Completion
a. Work Keys				
b. 60 College Credits				
c. Associate Degree				
d. Bachelor's Degree				
e. Master's Degree				
f. Doctorate (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)				

43. In the list of field and college majors below, please mark (with an "x") the box next to any areas in which you have certification:

EDUCATION

- ☐ **01 Elementary Education**
- ☐ **02 Middle School Education**
- ☐ **03 Secondary Education**
- ☐ **04 Mathematics Education**
- ☐ **05 Science Education**
- ☐ **06 Special Education**
- ☐ **07 Bilingual Education**
- ☐ **08 Early Childhood Education**

SCIENCE

- ☐ **11 Biology / Life Science**
- ☐ **12 Geology / Earth Science**
- ☐ **13 Chemistry**
- ☐ **14 Physics**
- ☐ **15 Engineering**
- ☐ **16 Other Natural Sciences**

MATH / COMPUTER SCIENCE

- ☐ **21 Mathematics**
- ☐ **22 Computer Science**

OTHER

- ☐ **31 English / Language Arts**
- ☐ **32 Social Science / Social Studies**
- ☐ **33 Vocational Ed./ Agriculture**
- ☐ **34 Arts/ Music**
- ☐ **35 Foreign Languages**
- ☐ **36 Philosophy**
- ☐ **37 Psychology**
- ☐ **38 Health / P.E.**
- ☐ **39 Administration**
- ☐ **40 Other (specify):**

  _____

Thank you very much for your help in completing this survey. Please insert summary into the attached envelope and return to:

HELEN OLIVER-BROOKS

APPENDIX B

Research Information Sheet

RESEARCH INFORMATION SHEET

AN INVESTIGATION OF TRADITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT VERSUS REFORM PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES, CURRICULUM AND CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT BY PRE-KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

Principal Investigator (PI): Helen Oliver-Brooks
Teacher Education
248.891.7911

Purpose

You are being invited to participate in a research study of traditional professional development versus reform professional development because you have participated in both types over the past two years and you are currently teaching in a Great Start Readiness Program Prekindergarten classroom. This study is being conducted at Wayne State University and The Detroit Federation of Teachers. The estimated number of study participants is about 132. **Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.**

In this research study, differences will be explored to determine if the level of High Scope implementation differs based on Traditional Professional Development and/or Reform Professional Development.

Study Procedures

If you agree to take part in this research study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire concerning 2010-2011 professional development and 2011-2012 professional development. The questionnaire also asks demographic questions, and will take approximately 25-30 minutes to complete. Your identity will not be identified in the discussion of the results. Examples of the questions are:

Which of the following describes (you) the participant in the 2010-2011 professional development? (Mark all that apply.) | *Not applicable. Did not participate*

- a. Listened to a lecture or presentation
- b. Discussed demonstration of a lesson, unit, or skill
- c. Led a whole-group discussion
- d. Led a small-group discussion
- e. Modeled a lesson, unit or skill
- f. Communicated with the leader

RESEARCH INFORMATION SHEET

AN INVESTIGATION OF TRADITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT VERSUS REFORM PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES, CURRICULUM AND CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT BY PRE-KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

What kinds of feedback or guidance did you receive as part of the 2010-2011 professional development? (Mark [X] all that applies) *// Not applicable-Did not participate*

- a. Practiced under simulated conditions, with feedback
- b. Received coaching or mentoring in the classroom
- c. Met formally with other activity participants to discuss classroom implementation
- d. My teaching was observed by the activity leader(s) and feedback was provided
- e. My teaching was observed by other participants and feedback was provided
- f. Communicated with the leader(s) of the activity concerning classroom implementation
- g. My students' work was reviewed by participants or the activity leader
- h. Met informally with other participants to discuss classroom implementation
- i. Developed lesson plans, which other participants or activity leader reviewed
- j. None

To what extent have you made each of the following changes in your teaching practices as a result of the High Scope professional development in 2010-2011? (Mark [X] one box for each practice). *// Not applicable-Did not participate.*

Questions "a-h" support ADULT-CHILD INTERACTION	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
a. Adults use some strategies to support communication with children whose primary language is not English		☐	☐	☐	☐

How many years of *preKindergarten* teaching/work experience do you have?

☐ 0 - 2 ☐ 3 - 5 ☐ 6 - 8 ☐ 8 - 11 ☐ 12 – or more

Benefits

As a participant in this research study, there are no known benefits to the participants.

Risks

There are no known risks at this time to participation in this study.

RESEARCH INFORMATION SHEET

AN INVESTIGATION OF TRADITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT VERSUS REFORM PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES, CURRICULUM AND CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT BY PRE-KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

Study Costs

Participation in this study will be of no cost to you.

Compensation

You will not be paid for taking part in this study.

Confidentiality

All information collected about you during the course of this study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. You will be identified in the research records by a code name or number. Information that identifies you personally will not be released without your written permission. However, the study sponsor, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Wayne State University, or federal agencies with appropriate regulatory oversight (e.g., Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), Office of Civil Rights (OCR), etc.) may review your records.

When the results of this research are published or discussed in conferences, no information will be included that would reveal your identity.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You have the right to choose not to take part in this study. You are free to only answer questions that you want to answer. Your decisions will not change any present or future relationship with Wayne State University or its affiliates, or other services you are entitled to receive.

Questions

If you have any questions about this study now or in the future, you may contact *Helen Oliver-Brooks* at the following phone number 248.891.7911. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, the Chair of the Institutional Review Board can be contacted at (313) 577-1628. If you are unable to contact the research staff, or if you want to talk to someone other than the research staff, you may also call (313) 577-1628 to ask questions or voice concerns or complaints.

APPROVAL PERIOD

Participation:
By completing the questionnaire, you are agreeing to participate in this study.

MAY 15 '12 MAY 02 '13

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Participant's Initials
IRB Date 05 11

APPENDIX C

HUMAN INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

IRB Administration Office
87 East Canfield, Second Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48201
Phone: (313) 577 1628
FAX: (313) 993-7122
http://irb.wayne.edu

NOTICE OF EXPEDITED APPROVAL

To: Helen Oliver-Brooks
College of Education

From: Dr. Scott Millis
Chairperson, Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3)

Date: May 15, 2012

RE: IRB #: 035712B3E

Protocol Title: An Investigation of Traditional Professional Development versus Reform Professional Development and the Implementation of Strategies, Curriculum and Classroom Environment by Prekindergarten Teachers

Funding Source:

Protocol #: 1203010731

Expiration Date: May 02, 2013

Risk Level / Category: Research not involving greater than minimal risk

---

The above-referenced protocol and items listed below (if applicable) were **APPROVED** following *Expedited Review* Category (#7)* by the Chairperson/designee for the Wayne State University Institutional Review Board (B3) for the period of 05/15/2012 through: 05/02/2013. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals that may be required.

- Revised Protocol Summary Form (received in the IRB Office 04/23/2012)
- Protocol (received in the IRB Office 04/23/2012)
- The request for a waiver of the requirement for written documentation of informed consent has been granted according to 45 CFR 46.117(1)(2). Justification for this request has been provided by the PI in the Protocol Summary Form. The waiver satisfies the following criteria: (i) the research involves no more than minimal risk to participants, (ii) the research involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context, (iii) the consent process is appropriate, and (iv) an informal or short disclosing the required and appropriate additional elements of consent disclosure will be provided to participants
- Research Information Sheet (dated 04/18/2012)
- Recruitment Script
- Data collection tools: Teacher Survey on Professional Development

---

- Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. You *may* receive a "*Continuation/Renewal Reminder*" approximately two months prior to the expiration date; however, it is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval *before* the expiration date. Data collected during a period of lapsed approval is unapproved research and can never be published or used. Plan accordingly.
- All changes or amendments to the above-referenced protocol require review and approval by the IRB **BEFORE** implementation.
- Serious Reportable Unexpected events (SRUEs) must be submitted on the appropriate form within the timeframe specified in the IRB Administration Office Policy (http://www.irb.wayne.edu/policies-human-research.html).

NOTE:

1. Upon publication of an impending regulatory site visit, hold notification and/or external audit the IRB Administration Office must be contacted immediately.
2. Forms should be downloaded from the IRB website for each use.

*Based on the Expedited Review List, revised November 1998

APPENDIX D

APPROVAL FROM DETROIT FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

DETROIT FEDERATION OF TEACHERS
2875 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Michigan 48202 • (313) 875-3500 • FAX (313) 875-3512

TO : **Marc Rosa, Ph.D. and Sharon Elliot, PhD,**
Wayne State University, College of Education, Curriculum and Instruction Department

FROM : **Keith Johnson, President, Detroit Federation of Teachers**

DATE : **January 31, 2012**

SUBJECT : **Permission to Conduct Research Using the 2011-2012 Teachers Assigned to Teach in the Great Start Readiness Program in Detroit Public Schools**

Permission is being granted to Helen Oliver-Brooks, a Wayne State University PhD candidate, to conduct research via a written survey.

Title of Study: An Investigation of Traditional Professional Development versus Reform Professional Development and the Implementation of Strategies, Curriculum and Classroom Environment by Pre kindergarten Teachers.

Principal Investigator (PI): Helen Oliver Brooks
WSU College of Education: Teacher Education
248.891.7911

Time-Frame for Data Collection:

Surveys will be mailed (from the DFT Office) on June 1, 2012 at the conclusion of the professional development session for the school year 2011-2012. This is a one-time distribution and collection. Helen Oliver-Brooks is responsible for the envelopes and postage for the surveys.

Study Procedures:

Participants will be asked to fill out a survey and complete a demographic questionnaire. The survey will focus on traditional and reform professional development training completed in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Completion of the survey will take approximately 25-30 minutes. Surveys will be mailed to the teachers including a stamped return envelope. Participation is strictly voluntary and no identifying information will be collected. The surveys will be mailed to the participants June 1, 2012 and the return date for completion is June 8, 2012.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Bierman, K. L., Domitrovich, C. E., Nix, R. L., & Gest, S. D., Welsh, J. A., Greenberg, M. T., . . . Gill, S. (2008). Promoting academic and social-emotional school readiness: The Head Start REDI program. *Child Development, 79*, 1802–1817. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01227.x

Birman, B. F., Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., & Garet, M. S. (2000). Designing professional development that works. *Educational Leadership, 57*(8), 1–8. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el200005_birman.pdf

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*(8), 3–15. doi: 10.3102/0013189X033008003

Brown, J.S., Collins, A. & Duguid, S. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 18* (1), 32-42. doi: 10.3102/0013189X018001032

Bruner, J. (1973). *Going beyond the information given.* New York: Norton.

Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's talk: Learning to use language*. New York: Norton.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Correnti, R., (2007). An empirical investigation of professional development effects on literacy instruction: Using daily logs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *29*(4), 262-295. doi: 10.3102/0162373707309074

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1997). *Fostering excellence: How state actions and support can help create successful schools*. Washington, DC: Author.

Danielson, C. (2001). (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership 58*(5), 12-15. Retrieved from: http://www.ascd.org/portal/site/ascd/template.MAXIMIZE/menuitem.459dee00

Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The challenge of staffing our schools. *Educational Leadership 58*(8), 12-17. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may01/vol58/num08/The-Challenge-of-Staffing-Our-Schools.aspx

Darling-Hammond, L. (2002). Defining 'Highly Qualified Teachers': What does 'Scientifically-Based Research' actually tell us? *Educational Researcher 31*(9), 13-25. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3594491

Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., Garet, M., Suk Yoon, K., & Birman, B. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 24*(2), 81-112. Retrieved from http://links.jstor.org/sici

Domitrovich, C., Gest, S., Gill, S., Jones, D., & DeRousie, R. (2009). Individual factors associated with professional development training outcomes of the Head Start REDI program. *Early Education and Development, 20*, 402-430. doi: 10.1080/10409280802680854

Fishman, B.J., & Krajcik, J. S. (2003). What does it mean to create sustainable Science curriculum innovations? *Science Education, 87*(4), 564-573. Retrieved from http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/34549/10088_ftp.pdf;jsessionid=308B36EE975DF708F136E4A885379F91?sequence=1

Fishman, B. J.,Marx, R. W., Best, S., & Tal, R. (2003). Linking teacher and student learning to improve professional development in systemic reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(6), 643-658. doi: 10.1016/S0742-051X(03)00059-3

Fuligni, A. S., Howes, C., Lara-Cinisomo, S. & Karoly, L. (2009): Diverse pathways in early childhood professional development: An exploration of early educators in public preschools, private preschools, and family child care homes. *Early Education & Development*, 20:3, 507-526. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20072719

Green, R.L., (2005). *Expectations: How teacher expectations can increase Student achievement and assist in closing the achievement gap*. Columbus, OH: SRA/McGraw Hill.

Howes, C., James, J., & Ritchie, S. (2003). Pathways to effective teaching. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 18,* 104–120. Retrieved from: www.ctserc.org

Jones, R. (1998). What Works. *American School Board Journal,* Vol. 185(4) 28–33.

Karp, N. (2006). Designing models for professional development at the local, state, and national levels. In M. Laslow & I. Martinez-Beck (Eds.). *Critical Issues in Early Childhood Professional Development* (pp. 225-230). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Koh, S., & Neuman, S.,B. (2009): The Impact of professional development in Family child care: A practice-based approach. *Early Education & Development, 20* (3), 537-562. Doi:10.1080/10409280902908841

Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Landry, S., Swank, P., Smith, K., Assel, M., & Gunnewig, S. (2006). Enhancing

early literacy skills for preschool children: Bringing a professional development model to scale. *Journal of Learning Disabilities,39*, 306–324.

Landry, S. H. & Swank, P. R. & Anthony, J.L. & Assel, M.A. (2010). *An experimental study evaluating professional development activities within a state funded prekindergarten program.* Published online: 8 June 2010 Springer Science Business Media B.V. 2010.

Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics, and culture in everyday life.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1990). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge , UK :Cambridge University: Press.

Loucks-Horsley, S., & Matsumoto, C. (1999). Research on professional development for teachers of mathematics and science: The state of the scene. *School Science and Mathematics, 99*(5), 258-271. doi: 10.1111/j.1949-8594.1999.tb17484.x

Little, J.W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 15(2),* 129-151. doi: 10.3102/01623737015002129

Matsumura, L. C., Garnier, H. E., Correnti, R., Junker, B., & Bickel, D. D. (2010). Investigating the effectiveness of a comprehensive literacy coaching program in schools with high teacher mobility. *Elementary School Journal, 111*(1), 35–62. doi: 10.1086/653469

Mouza, C.(05/01/2009). Does research-based professional development make a difference? A longitudinal investigation of teacher learning in technology integration. *Teachers College Record (1970) (0161-4681)*, *111* (5), 1195. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org ID Number: 15479

National Staff Development Council. (2009). Standards for staff development. Retrieved from http://www.nsdc.org/standards/index.cfm.

Neuman, S. B., & Cunningham, L. (2009). The impact of professional development and coaching on early language and literacy practices. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(2), 532–566. doi: 10.3102/0002831208328088

Penuel, W. R., Fishman, J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What Makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(4), 921-958. doi: 10.3102/0002831207308221

Pianta, R.C. (2011). Chapter 11. A degree is not enough: Teachers need stronger and more individualized professional development supports to be effective in the classroom. In Zigler, E., Gilliam, W.S., Barnett, W.S. (Eds.), *The Pre-K debates: Current controversies & issues* (pp. 64-68). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Pianta, R.C.,Howes,C.,Burchinal,M.,Bryant,D.,Clifford,R,.Early,C.,et al. (2005). Features of prekindergarten programs, classrooms and teachers: Do they predict observed classroom quality and child-teacher interactions? *Applied Developmental Science*, 9 (3), 144-159.

Pianta, R., Mashburn, A., Downer, J., Hamre, B., & Justice, L. (2008). Effects of web-mediated professional development resources on teacher-child interactions in prekindergarten classrooms. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *23*, 431-451.

Powell, D. R., Diamond, K. E., Burchinal, M.R., & Koehler, M.J. (2010). Effects of an early literacy professional development intervention on Head Start teachers and children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(2), 299-312. doi: 10.1037/a0017763.

Raver, C.C., Jones, A.S., Li-Grining, C.P., Metzger, M., Smallwood, K., & Sardin, L. (2008). Improving preschool classroom processes: Preliminary findings from a randomized trial implemented in Head Start settings. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 23*, 10-26.

Putnam, R. T., & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say about research on teacher learning? *Educational Researcher, 21*(1), 4–15.

Reeves, D.B. (2010). *Transforming professional development into student results.* Alexandria, VA. ASCD.

Renyi, J. (1998). Building learning into the teaching job. *Educational Leadership*,*55* (5) 70-74.

Sparks, D. (2004). Chapter 11. Focusing staff development on improving the learning of all students. In Cawelti, G. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on improving student achievement* (pp. 245 – 255). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Sparks, D., & Hirsh, S. (1997). *A new vision of staff development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development/National Staff Development Council.

Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Five models of staff development. In

W. Robert Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education.* New York: Macmillan, 1990.

Youniss, J. (1980). *Parents and Peers in Social Development: A Sullivan-Piaget Perspective*. Chicago; Univ. Chicago Press

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Zaslow, M. J., & Martinez-Beck, I. (Eds.). (2006). *Critical issues in early childhood professional development.* Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF TRADITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT VERSUS REFORM PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES, CURRICULUM AND CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT BY PRE-KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

by

HELEN OLIVER-BROOKS

May 2013

Advisor: Dr. Marc Rosa

Major: Curriculum and Instruction

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

The purpose of this study is to investigate differences between traditional conventional professional development and high quality reflective professional development and curriculum implementation of classroom practices. This study examined the extent to which professional development activities were associated with increased levels of curriculum implementation. Differences in curriculum implementation, teacher knowledge, and changes to teaching practice based upon the type of professional development that teachers have experienced were a focus of this study.

A sample of 132 prekindergarten teachers engaged in implementation of a newly adopted curriculum, High Scope, participated in the study. Professional development was provided for two consecutive academic years (2010-2011 and 2011-2012). Traditional professional development (lecture, large group, lower frequency, and no active participation) was provided during the first year. The second year, teachers participated in reform professional development programs (smaller groups, one location, consistent presenter, immediate on-going feedback/support, cohort/team approach, interaction, and a higher frequency of training sessions). Teachers completed a survey of the final day of the reform professional development session at the end of the 2012 school year. The findings were consistent with studies of

significant professional development and the teachers' conclusions about how effective specific types of training influenced their understanding and implementing of the curriculum. The findings further supported the significance of immediate feedback and consequently the on-going classroom, phone, text, email, and other means of support for promoting the High Scope curriculum implementation in the prekindergarten classroom.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

HELEN OLIVER BROOKS

Education	Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 2013 – Doctor of Philosophy Major: Curriculum and Instruction Minor: Sociology 1986 – Masters of Education Major: Preschool and Parenting Education 1984 – Bachelors of Science Major: Liberal arts "Family and Consumer Resources"
Certifications	30 hour continuing certificate Elementary Self-Contained K-8 Social Science (CX) 9 English as a Second Language (NS) K-8 Early Childhood Education Pre K-K (ZA)
Professional Experience	1984 to Present Detroit Public Schools, Detroit, MI 1984 to 1992 – Fairbanks Elementary School Teacher, parent coordinator, Girl Scout Leader 1992 to 2001 – Paul Robeson Academy Teacher 1991 to 2002 – Northwest Early Childhood Center Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Curriculum Supervisor and Administrator in Charge 2001 to Present – Foundation for Early Learners Prekindergarten Program Supervisor
Other Experiences	1999 to Present – University of Detroit Mercy, School of Education Adjunct Faculty 2000 to Present – Mary Grove College, School of Education Adjunct Faculty
Professional Organizations	National Association for the Education of Young Children Michigan Association for the Education of Young Children ASCD Association for Childhood Education International